



Published
by
THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB
600 North Rossmore
Hollywood 4, California

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. V.

JANUARY, 1868.

No. 1.

THE WILL OF GOD.

I.

[Not every one that says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven ; but he that does the will of my Father who is in heaven.]

THIS language is equally true, whether it be construed as relating to the present or to the everlasting kingdom. The Savior may have designed it to apply to both ; though it is most likely he intended it to apply chiefly to the latter. But indisputably a man can no more enter the former without doing the will of God, than he can the latter. True his will differs as to the two, but in both cases alike it must be done. In neither can it be dispensed with.

What now, according to this language, makes the great material difference between him who enters the kingdom of God, and him who enters it not ? Clearly it is not the fact, for fact it is not, that God did, long ere time began, inexorably decree that one definite portion of the human family should go to heaven, and the other definite portion should go to hell. Such decree has no existence save in the brains of those who teach it. It is the decree of men and not of God, and is therefore null. What, then, I repeat, makes the difference ?

Not the fact, in the next place, that the Bible is a sealed book to one man, but an open book to another. The Bible is the same book to all. To the gifted and to the humble its pages lie open alike, resplendent in the light of divine wisdom. It is not a sealed book. No. But some men are sealed men ; here lies the difficulty. They have sealed up their eyes, sealed up their ears, sealed up their hearts ; they are a sealed book, but not the Bible.

Better for them that it was the Bible. In this case they would have no sin ; not so, however, as it is.

Neither does the difference consist in the fact that some men are spiritually dead, and can not understand the Bible ; while others are spirittally alive, and can. No such difference naturally exists among men. It may be true that some men can not understand the Bible, as I well know it is, but this is owing to no fact expressed in the phrase "spiritual death." By the way, what do men mean by this expression ? What is it to be spiritually dead ? Carries the language an intelligible meaning ; especially, carries it a scriptural one ? I will not say it does not ; I am simply asking questions. What it is to be physically dead we know ; that is, we know it in so far as we can claim knowledge in any sense of that occult thing we call death. We know it is the death of the body. Life goes out—what is that ? and the body is left pulseless and motionless, and begins to moulder back to dust. But what is spiritual death ? Is it the death of the spirit ? If not, what is it ? Does the language mean that the spirit literally dies, as dies the body ; that the life thereof goes out, and that it is left a still and motionless thing ? If this be its meaning, we know its meaning to be false. A lifeless spirit, if not a contradiction in fact, is certainly a most inconceivable thing. The spirit never dies. In the body or out of it, in heaven or in hell, it is still alive. Will not some learned doctor, deep read in the things unknown in the Bible, tell us the meaning of the expression "spiritual death ?" I hope so. I am seeking light now. The difference, then, respecting which I inquire, is traceable to no difference between being spiritually alive and spiritually dead. In what, I ask again, does it consist ?

It consists simply and precisely in *doing* and *not* doing the will of God. He goes in who *does* that will—goes into the present kingdom, goes into the future. He who does it *not* goes into neither. Doing and not doing, then, make the difference, and make the whole difference. Hence, in the work of redemption a man has something to do ; and on his deed hang consequences of deepest significance. The doer is here, therefore, as in thousands of other instances, by a great law of God, blessed in his deed. Let now

blind guides clamor as they will, still on doing and not doing hang issues of no less moment than those of life and death. What confidence, consequently, can we repose in him who still persists in teaching that man can do nothing, and hence has nothing to do? The Bible is against him, reason is against him, universal human conduct, and hence his own, is against him. Indisputably he is in error.

But in the present case man is not left to his own discretion. He is not at liberty to do anything. The will of God, and that only, must he do. If he do anything else, he is a presumptuous repudiator of God. He has set the divine and therefore the unerring will at naught, and set up the human and hence the fearfully fallible will in its stead. This man can never be blessed in his deed. Possibly he may be blessed in spite of it; but in it he can not be.

What is the will of God? To this question the first answer is necessary. For, it is intuitively clear that unless we know what the will of God is, we can never feel certain that we are doing it. What, then, I repeat, is the will of God?

The answer to this question I can best obtain by being a little indirect. What, I accordingly put it to the reader, is your best conception of law? You reply: Law is a rule of action, a rule thus and so prescribed, and having such and such sanctions. Correct, so far as the books are concerned. But this is no definition of law, taking that term in its highest and most comprehensive sense. It is a definition of a species of law, a definition of municipal and civil law, but not of law simply. But what we want is, not a definition of a species, but a definition of the genus. We want a definition of law in the last and highest conception of it. Anything short of this meets not the case in hand. What, then, is *law*—law in the closest and severest possible view of it? I answer:

II.

Law is will. This both comprehends and exhausts the conception. It is brief, strikingly brief, yet it includes the whole idea. As a definition, I do not see how it could be altered for the better. It includes all that enters strictly into the notion of law, and ex-

cludes everything that does not. Shorter it could not be ; for it is couched in three monosyllables ; and to make it clearer would be impossible. As a definition, therefore, it may be safely accepted as faultless.

But mark, I do not say that will is law, but only that law is will. This is true ; that is not, without qualification. That is, it is not true that will, all will, is law. It is certainly true that some will is law, but not that all is. In my own family, within certain limits, my will is law ; but it is no law in any sense in my neighbor's family. Again : Satan is endowed with a will of fearful power and range ; but it is no law. A rule of action with the wicked, whether demons or men, it certainly is ; still it is not law, for the notion of law includes the notion of right ; or if not the positive notion of right, it at least excludes all notion of wrong. Hence Satan's will can in no true sense be denominated a law.

But all law is will ; and this is true whether the reference be to divine or human law. What, for example, are the laws of the State in which I write ? Simply the will of the people, as expressed through their representatives, met to give formal and authoritative utterance thereto. To this only one exception can exist ; and this, in fact, is not an exception, but only a seeming one. The governor, or other officer, may be endowed with certain discretionary powers. In this case, and for the purpose prescribed, the expression of his individual will is the law. But this, as already said, is no exception to the general proposition. The law is will. True, it is not the will of the people ; but it is the will of one whose will the people have agreed to accept as their own. This constitutes it their law.

So in the case specially in hand. God's law is his will. To this proposition an exception can not arise. It is universally true.

Now it so happens that God's will assumes two forms, accordingly as it relates to rational, accountable beings, or to mere matter. In that case, his will is *expressed* ; in this, it is *impressed*. On all mere material or inanimate things God silently impresses his will ; and this impressed will constitutes that vast and intri-

cate code we call the laws of nature. Here only is obedience perfect. All things alike obey it; and nothing rebels against it. On the little pebble that lies on the beach it is impressed; and there, in conformity to it, it sleeps for countless ages, never moving, unless moved by something without it and disturbing it. Alike to the orb which makes day resplendent with its golden light, is it the law of its being and its motion. On globe and atom, star and plant, it acts, upholding and sustaining all. The life of the seraph and the life of the animalcule is each dependent on it. The mantle of light which hangs on the face of the sun, and the ray which sparkles in the dew-drop, take their origin in it. Nothing is, nothing lives, nothing moves, without it. The tornado that lays forest and city low, and the gentle breeze which fans the feverish brow, receive their impetus from it. By it exist the cold which congeals the depths of a northern sea, and the heat which burns in the tropics. The shadows of night and the gorgeous tinting of the evening cloud are its handiwork. How overwhelming, how inconceivable it is, when viewed as the law to nature!

What, then, is this law? Some mere material code, like matter, standing apart from God, and though enacted by him, acting independently of him? Something inhering in matter, which, though originally traceable to the divine mind, now has no connection with it? Something which might be if he were not; something which now, at least, is self-sustaining; something which God has put away from him, and about which he has no further care—is this the law of nature? I confess I do not so conceive of it. With me the laws of nature are but the divine will in action on mere material things. They are, in other words, simply that will viewed in reference to nature. The divine will is not one thing and the laws of nature a different thing; the laws of nature are that will itself. Hence there is no such thing as a law of nature which is self-acting. Each of these laws is but another name for so much of the divine will as is there acting.

Here emerges the folly of asking how it is that God can contravene the laws of nature to answer prayer. One part of his will can never be in collision with another part. These laws are

his will. Hence, if he will to answer prayer, there is no conflict of will with law ; but only will acting in harmony with itself. Therefore, when God answers prayer, no law of nature is contravened.

But to rational and accountable beings God *expresses* his will ; that is, he embodies it in the form of articulate speech. Indeed, it is only in this form that it can be called law. Previous to this it may be will, but it is not law. It becomes law only when spoken, never before. This expressed will we call God's law respecting man ; and I like the word expressed. Etymologically it means pressed out of. God's kindness to man has pressed out of him his will respecting us. This expressed will is to us law, *the law*—the law of our higher being and higher life, the law of our spirits and of their states or modes of existence. Not one sentence in it can be disregarded without danger. All must, unless repealed, be obeyed. It is the embodiment of the divine wisdom and goodness and authority. The obligation to obey it is, consequently, infinite. As in nature no law, whether it relate to a planet or the smallest seed of grass, can be dispensed with ; so in Christianity. Whether the law relate to the immortality of the soul, or a single hair of the head, it becomes a sublime necessity and must be heeded.

III.

I next proceed to trace, if it be lawful for mortals so to speak, the will of God from his own mind to the point where it begins to bind us, and to determine the form it assumes that we may obey it. I want further carefully to note the pains the merciful Father has been at to transmit this will to us in a form which renders it absolutely pure, and which hence renders conformity to it infinitely safe.

The very expression, the will of God, refers us at once back to his mind as the ultimate source in which the will originates. Beyond this, no inquiry as to its origin is possible. From this forward, we may trace it ; from this back, we can not.

On all hands, it will be admitted that God has not directly and immediately communicated his will to us. In other words, he has

not stood before us and addressed us in his own proper person. He has spoken to us through angels, through prophets, through his Son. No living man has ever heard his voice or seen his glorious form. From us this has been forever hid ; to us that has been ever silent. Through others, not at once from his own lips, has his will come to us.

To whom, then, first did he communicate so much of his will as now binds us ? Promptly I answer, to his Son. " God, who, in many parts and in many ways, spoke in time past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by his Son." Again : " The word which you hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me." Still further : " All power is given to me in heaven and on earth." In the matter in hand, then, the mind of the Son stood next to the mind of the Father. In other words, the Father communicated immediately with the Son in transmitting his will. No other mind, as medium, intervened between the two. They touched each other, so to speak, in the transaction.

Now it will be conceded by all that error could not possibly intrude itself into this will, while it was in transition from the mind of the Father to that of the Son. Corruption and perversion were alike impossible here. That will was as pure and as authoritative in the mind of the Son as when in the mind of the Father. The character of the parties and the nature of the transaction guarantee immaculateness. With force undiminished and purity unsullied, that will left the mind of God ; and as it left his mind, so it entered that of the Son.

What the medium of communication was we have no means of saying. From one of the passages previously cited, we would seem to be safe in inferring that it was words ; and that mind can communicate with mind in any other way is at least inconceivable by us. But the point is not here raised for discussion. Certainly it is a subject for curious thought ; perhaps for nothing more.

But the will of God respecting man, let us conceive, has now passed into the mind of the Son. To us, he is now the embodiment of the will which concerns us. We look to him for its

further and authoritative publication. The Father himself has constituted him locutor for us. "This is my beloved Son, *hear him.*" From this utterance forward, through all time to its end, we go to the lips of Christ for law. What he now teaches is the matter of our faith; what he commands, the sum and the rule of our duty. Nothing remains but to hear him. Every word he speaks is henceforth weighty with sense for us. We can not afford to lose even one. Life, endless life, is in these words. God's will is in them, and God's will is life. Not only is life in them; but all the conditions of spiritual happy life are in them. They contain the very law of the soul's being and bliss. Without them all is darkness and death; the darkness and death of the mind. Can we estimate them too highly? It is impossible. Can we obey them too strictly? Never. As we value the untasted, ineffable pleasures of vast and measureless eternity, so let us lay these words up in our hearts as in the caskets in which the Lord designs them to be kept.

But we have not immediate access to the mind of the Son. Who among men can claim to know it? Not one. To whom next, then, does he communicate the will which is to us the law of life? Not to man. The time is not come when it is to be confided to him. Into his mind that will is not yet to be flashed. For God communicates it as he sheds on us the light of the sun. He does not fling it down upon us all at once. Our eyes are not strong enough for this. In its unsoftened intensity, it would destroy vision. He sends that light a long way, sends it through various mediums; one refracts it a little, another absorbs some of it, until at last it falls upon the eye subdued and softened—the grateful medium of sight. So with his will. It is not darted directly into our minds like a ray from the infinite Source. It reaches us in a form adapted to us, in a form to do us good, in a form to wake our deepest and purest pleasures, and to excite our highest joys. To whom, then, is it transferred from the Savior? *To the Holy Spirit.* The will of God passes from the mind of the Savior into the mind of the Spirit. Here again its purity is pledged. No error, neither admixture of error, can find its way into that will in its passage from the one of these

minds into the other. It is as perfect in the mind of the latter as in that of the former, and as perfect in both as in that of the Father.

But how does Christ impart this will to the Spirit? He himself tells us. In speaking of the Spirit, he says: "I have yet many things to say to you, but you can not bear them now; but when he, the Spirit of the truth, is come, he will lead you into all the truth; for he shall not speak from himself, but whatever he may hear, he will speak; and he will show you the things to come." Again: "All things that the Father has are mine; therefore, I said, he shall take of mine and show to you."

From the Savior, then, the Spirit *heard* these things; therefore the Savior must have spoken these things to the Spirit. Again: as between the Father and the Son, so between the Son and Spirit, language seems to have been the channel of communication. Nor should this seem strange to us. Spirit alone can speak; for spirit alone can think; and thought and speech imply each other. He who can not think can not speak, and he who can speak can think. Thought inheres not in materiality; in spirit alone it is. God is spirit, not *a* spirit, but spirit; and in him thought and speech have their fountain. Had he not thought, no other being had ever thought; had he not spoken, speech had never been. The *Logos* was spirit, and hence a thinker and speaker. This, too, is the nature of *the* Spirit; therefore it likewise both thinks and speaks. It is not the human body that speaks, but the spirit which dwells in it. Take that spirit out, and speech is gone. Speech, human speech, resides only in the spirit, and this whether that spirit be in the body or out of it. No more does being in the body determine the human spirit's power to speak, than does that fact determine the power of the *Logos* to speak. The human spirit, we know, speaks in the body; and from its very nature we infer its ability to speak out of it. Rather should we not say, it speaks out of the body, and can speak in it despite of it. Is not the body rather a hindrance than an aid? A fallen body doubtless is; but not so, we hope, a spiritual one.

This brings me to say but a word of human speech. This side of the dwelling-place of the Most High, I can think of no greater

mystery. I am overwhelmed and lost in bewilderment when I attempt to analyze and comprehend it. What is speech, human speech? The subtle thing surpasses my keenest search. It is sound, yet not mere sound, for thought is in it; and this is what perplexes me. How can sound embody thought? But is there really thought in it? Or is the thought in the mind already, and does the utterance of a certain sound merely call it out? Does thought pass from mind to mind? It must be; but how? What is a thought? I know not; and yet I know little else. But one is in my mind, and I want to impart it. The mind selects a conventional sound, wraps that thought in it, and thus sends it away into other minds. This adjusting thought and sound one to the other is delicate work. Who can master it? Yet this is speech. Talk not of the mystery of miracle, not of the inscrutable; neither go in search of them. In the word that drops from your lip you have enough of each. Solve the hidden secret of that word before you seek for more.

IV.

But to return. We have now traced the divine will from the mind of God into the mind of the Son, and from the mind of the Son into the mind of the Spirit. What next? It has not yet reached the point where it becomes law. It still remains will. Therefore we must trace it on. The next step, then, what is it?

It is just at this point that human agency is brought into requisition. Henceforward God and man are workers together. With him, through him, by him, and for him the Father of mercies works now. Joint labor and copartnership are from this on the rule. The Spirit now takes up its abode in the apostles. This is the next step. In it dwells the will of God; in them dwells the Spirit. Still that will has not yet become law. One more remove, and we shall see it assume this form. What next does the Spirit? Does it merely communicate to the apostles the divine thought, and leave them to select the term in which to express it? It certainly communicates to them the thought, but does it nothing more? If not, do we feel perfectly secure against error? Are the apostles, aided only in the reception of the thought, competent to the task

of giving it faultless utterance? I do not so feel; at least, I am afraid to trust them. I see too clearly how and where Satan could interfere to corrupt the divine will, and thus in a measure defeat the divine purpose. Too easily could he suggest the wrong word, either wholly or in part. In either case the result would be the keeping back of a part of that which is to be our law of life; or he could suggest too many words, and thus would result dissipation and confusion. Hence the work of the Spirit does not end with simply suggesting the thought. On the contrary, it both suggests the thought, and selects the word in which to express it. How it suggested the thought we can not with certainty say. I strongly incline to the opinion that it spoke it to the apostles while in them. This we know to have been its procedure in the case of Philip; and this most likely was the rule. Why, may be pertinently asked, should any other have been used? Certainly the thought could be as clearly and as unerringly presented by simply speaking it in its own appropriate term as in any other way conceivable by us. Why, then, not adopt it? There is a strong propensity in men to make the Spirit move on the human family in some inscrutable way. We are fond of the mysterious, and love to invest everything with it, especially religion. At best, the work of the Spirit is unsearchable enough. With needless difficulty, therefore, we surely should not seek to encumber it. If there be so much as even one of its acts which clearly lies within the intelligible to us, let us by all means try to keep it there. I hence see no reason why we should wish to make it appear that the Spirit merely suggested, in some way unknowable to common men, the divine ideas it had to communicate. If there is probable evidence even in the lowest degree that it imparted these ideas in speech, let us accept this as the better view, and therewith rest content.

V.

Here a little expansion becomes necessary. The things over the communication and transmission of which the Spirit presided, distribute themselves into two classes: 1. Those things which were strictly matters of revelation—the *τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, as Paul phrases them—the things which are from God. 2. The

facts and events which took place on earth, which enter into the body of Christianity. The former had to be first revealed and then transmitted ; the latter had to be preserved and transmitted. But in each case alike the agency of the Spirit is necessary. All can feel how it would be necessary in revealing the things of God. Equally necessary would it be in transmitting them in a form perfectly pure. Nor would its agency be less necessary in the second class. These become, in large measure, the proof of the former. The necessity, therefore, to preserve them and transmit them would be absolute and most stringent. Hence, whether the contents of the New Testament be severely matters of revelation, that is, matters emanating wholly from the mind of God, or merely events transpiring on earth, but essential parts of the divine plan, the Spirit becomes the speaker who gives utterance to them, or the penman who transmits them to posterity. How it does this more particularly I must at once proceed to show. We have now reached a stage in our train of thought which is absorbingly interesting.

VI.

Touching the particular point we have now reached, Paul thus speaks : "Now we have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God, that we might know the things given to us from God, which we also speak, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the Spirit."

From this passage two most important conclusions result : 1. That the things of God—his will and purposes respecting man, were communicated to the apostles immediately by the Spirit. 2. That the apostles spoke these things to men, not in words of their own choice, but in words selected by the Spirit. To them, therefore, the Holy Spirit stood as the immediate author of what they said, and as teacher of the words in which they said it. This precludes the possibility of error ; for if the Spirit furnished the thought and selected the word in which to express it, infallibility is secured.

We hear much said in the present day respecting spiritual agency and influence in the work of redemption. It may be well,

just at this point, to digress long enough to request the reader's close attention to what is now being presented. He may not fail to collect some food for profitable thought.

Thus far, then, we have traced the things of God—his will and all things else which concern us, from his mind into that of the Son; from the mind of the Son into that of the Spirit; and now from the mind of the Spirit into the words in which it saw fit to allow them to be uttered. In the matter of revelation we have now reached the great work of the Spirit. Its task is henceforth matching thoughts and words together, fitting the thought into the word, so that the word shall carry the thought precisely, neither more nor less, and plant it in the soul of man. The thought is the seed of the eternal, future life; the word the casket which carries it. Or let me borrow from nature a still more beautiful illustration. We go out into the forest and pick up from under a tree a nut. Without, to the touch, it is a hard, bony substance. We crack this nut, and within is the seed proper of the future tree. It is inimitably fitted into that hard exterior. Into every corner and depression of that house not made with hands it is packed away, the outer surface of the one answering to the inner surface of the other, as eye to eye in a perfect mirror. So in the case in hand. The word is the mere outer covering which inwraps the subtle spiritual essence within, in which dwells life. My words are life, said Christ. As in the case of the Savior, so in the present. In his case earth furnished the outer man; heaven furnished the inner; in this, earth furnishes the word, heaven the thought within it. That constituted the Christ; this is revelation. Here again is co-operation. God furnishes the thought; man the term to carry it. The two act together, and not one without the other.

When once the Spirit has selected the term and fitted the thought in it, then the apostles begin to act. Their part is now to speak the word; to speak it to the human family; and the instant they give it utterance, it becomes the law of God to man. It is now his expressed will; and this is the truest conception of his law. But this includes only so much of his will as consists in direct revelations from his mind. This, however, is not the whole of the matter essential to life. Many of the facts of

Christ's history, with many in the lives of the apostles, become essential. How do these so become; and what constitutes them a part of the divine plan? The answer is easy. As soon as the Holy Spirit selects a fact or incident, and embodies it in the proper form of words, it, too, becomes a part of the divine volume. But there is this distinction to be kept in mind: the fact is not the will of God; it may be the result of his will, but itself is not his will. His will is that we believe the fact. In this view, therefore, the whole of the divine volume becomes the will of God. Its contents are either the direct expression of his will, or facts which he wills to have preserved. Thus the whole book is stamped with his sanction. How fearful a thing, then, is it either to presume to disobey it, or to annul any part of it!

We have now traced the divine will to the point where it becomes law. It may be interesting to pursue it a little further. Several important facts can thus be brought out, which otherwise must remain concealed.

VII.

As soon as the truth is uttered, as now already shown, it enters the ear of the human family. Thence it goes into the mind and heart, to the former of which it is light, to the latter controlling power. When in the heart, it becomes the seed of faith, and faith the primary ground of life. "Those by the way-side are they that *hear*; then comes the Devil and takes the word out of their *hearts*, lest they should *believe* and be *saved*. Never, therefore, does Satan attempt to interfere with the will of God till after it leaves the apostles' lips or pens. Then his work begins. He first seeks to interpolate the divine volume, and thereby corrupt it. He next endeavors to eclipse its light by false interpretations. In the third place, he attempts to substitute mere human tenets for its contents; and in the last place, when all these methods fail, he tries to pluck its teachings out of the heart. Thus this great enemy works against God, and for the ruin of man. How successfully he does this, alas, how many of the human family have long since in endless anguish learned! Why is he permitted this power? To this we can obtain no answer while in the flesh.

In man's will resides his power ; in God's will resides his. God's will is therefore almighty, because he is. Where this will, moreover, is perfectly obeyed, there is perfection indeed,—perfect order, perfect peace, perfect happiness. On the other hand, where it is broken, there is sin and every misery. Just in proportion as this will enters and takes control of a man, he becomes happy. Indeed, it is God's power to control the human family, and the only power which he is known to exert directly on them. Neither is any other necessary. This is enough, unless resisted ; and when resisted none can avail. From history and experience we have learned what power some men's will possesses to control their race. Whole nations are sometimes swayed by the bidding of a single man. This power is not in their physical organism. It is in their minds. Their wills lay hold of men, and they are spell-bound by it. They seem now to lose their personal identity. Henceforward they have neither mind nor will of their own. Their law of thought and rule of action are the will of another. Thus should it be with men, at least in the mysterious concerns of the spirit. We do not know enough of these to attempt to determine what our action should be in them. God, who knows them altogether, should be accepted as our guide.

Furthermore, the Savior said : “ No man can come to me except the Father who sent me *draw* him.” God's will is the power with which he draws. It is this in the soul which holds it in check, and leads it up to God. This is the bright puissant essence which, on the altar of the cold charred heart of man, kindles its spark of life. As it came from God, so to him it seeks to return ; as it came for man, so it seeks to bear him back. Nothing but his own willful opposition can prevent it.

Finally, in the New Testament we now have the will of God respecting man. This is our rule of life, the very matter and law of our spiritual being. Not one word in it can be dispensed with, nor one precept be neglected. All must be believed, all be done. He who obeys its initial laws enters the kingdom of God ; he who keeps its more elaborate code will enter the everlasting one. Henceforth, then, let our song and prayer be,

“ By thy word and Spirit guide me,
Till I reach thy courts above.”

EMANATION OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT.

I.

THIS subject, though a speculative one, is yet not devoid of interest and importance. The conclusions which its discussion may discover may be of the highest importance and significance. They may have a wider range and a more sweeping character than we at first imagine. Already I see, in the language of your correspondent E., that it is a subject of vital importance. If the human spirit is subject to the same laws as the organism, and as dependent on the reproductive system for its existence as is the organism,—if the spirit is as verily reproduced from the spirit of the parent as the organism is from the body,—then who can not see that the spirit must be just as material as the organism? It seems to me that materialism inheres in E.'s views of the origin of the human spirit, and that it involves the ultimate conclusion that the soul is not inherently immortal, and that it will, consequently, perish with the organism, if God impress it not with an immortal nature at the resurrection of the just. This is the cardinal doctrine of materialism, based on just such a view of the spirit's origin as is advanced by E. That I may not be thought to misrepresent him, I will reproduce his own language: "The beasts that have spirits beget them alike with their bodies, and beasts bring them forth. * * * If so with the beasts, why not so with man? If the spirit of a beast is derived to it mediately, though a beast, from God, why not the spirit of man through man?" All this might be so, if man were only a beast. But if there be in him anything more than is found in beasts, what can be inferred in regard to its origin from the origin of beasts? If beasts have spirits, and these spirits are begotten with their bodies; and if man's spirit differs in nothing from theirs, and he is no more than a beast, then the statement of E. might be correct. But there are too many contingencies here for us to draw any legitimate conclusion in regard to the origin of the human

spirit. Such a view as that of E.'s is nothing better than gross materialism. It reduces man to the level of beasts, and makes his spirit as verily dependent on the reproductive system for its existence as the organism, and this virtually denies to man a nature superior to that of beasts. Such a view, it seems to me, needs only to be clearly stated to be instantly rejected by every rational thinker.

II.

To prove a view false, it is not always necessary to pursue the direct method of proof. It is sometimes sufficient to show that it contradicts acknowledged facts or well-established conclusions. As regards this subject, we may say that this view of the derived nature, or organic origin of the human spirit, is false, because it involves the conclusion that the spirit is just as mortal as the body, a conclusion in direct conflict with the positive statements of the sacred Scriptures: "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Therefore, as materialism denies the inherent immortality of the spirit, what can be more materialistic than this view of the derived nature or organic origin of the human spirit? If the organism is material because it is perishable, and perishable because it is derived, then are we justified in characterizing the view of the spirit's derived nature as the grossest materialism.

Since materialists deny that man has an immortal spirit dwelling in him, distinct and separable from his body, and capable of an independent existence, they virtually deny that there is in him any spirit nature that distinguishes him from an animal. The spirit nature of their organism is not a personal and distinct being, but simply a spirit nature impersonally manifested in the psychological phenomena of organized beings; and hence, if the spirit nature in man be as truly of the organism as theirs, then is man not to be distinguished from a beast.

Materialism has been shown a thousand times to have no foundation in reason or revelation, and yet it continues to thrust itself into notice under one garb or another. Sometimes it assumes one form and sometimes another, but in all forms it is the same, affirming that man is but a very intelligent beast; and that im-

mortality is an attribute of being not predicable of man, nor enjoyable by him, unless specially bestowed on him at the resurrection of the just. If our vision was circumscribed by the horizon of nature, then, indeed, there would be some excuse in supposing that man is but an animal. So far as we can see, he lives and dies like them; and when we sweep our minds over the whole series of organized beings, we are puzzled to know on what rests his wonderful mind. It seems to differ from mind in animals only as to its sweep, range, and capacity. But this difference is but little more remarkable and wonderful than what is observed between the higher and the lower orders of animals.

But we are not limited to the light of nature. The great volume of revelation lies open before us. The divine authenticity of this volume your correspondent recognizes as fully as he does the verity of that which we call nature. In this volume the soul is everywhere recognized as immortal; for it contemplates the destruction of man's present organism, and his investment with a new body in the heavens. On the other hand, it recognizes the inherent perishability of animals in their entire being. That which is divested of the animal body and invested with a spiritual and immortal body, that which lives after the destruction of the present organism, must be that spirit-being in man usually denominated the soul. The soul is not a mere breath, an impersonal thing, but an intelligent, conscious person, with all the attributes of personality.

Such being the almost universal conception of the human spirit, I shall take it as established that there is in man a spirit-being, who constitutes the real *ego*, and who is capable of an existence independent of the present organism, whose being is essentially immortal and imperishable.

III.

Whence, then, this being? From God immediately; or from him mediately through the animal organism? Is he a primary or a secondary creation? Is the spirit in its origin genetically or derivatively connected with the organism; or is it created independently of it? Your correspondent thinks that the spirit could

have had no existence but for the organism ; whereas the true state of the case is, as it regards man's creation, that the organism could have had no existence but for the real or virtual existence of the spirit. He objects to your statement that the human spirit is an immediate creation, wholly independent, in its origin, of the animal organism, and having no derivative connection with it. To object to this statement is equivalent to the assertion that the spirit owes its existence to the animal organism—that it could have had no existence but for the organism. This is the view of E., as is clear from the following language, which is in the form of a conclusion : " That the children do, by generation, as fully and entirely receive their souls and spirits as they do their bodies."

The issue is now fairly and clearly made, and let us see which view is sustained by the phenomena of the organic world and the light of revelation. And

1. Is the spirit derived ? Is it derived from the spirit of the parent, as the organism is from the body ? To say that it is derived, is to assert that it could have had no existence but for the animal organism, because this is the only method by which beings like man can be multiplied. The reproductive system is the only means by which individuals of species can be produced. This is its design in this world. Its products are as truly creations as the original pairs, though of a different category. That there are different kinds of creations will be evident on a little reflection. And

(a) There is the pure creation of something which did not previously exist,—of "something out of nothing," as the material universe ;

(b) The creation of something out of something previously existing, as the organic world out of the material ; and

(c) The creation of living beings by a system of reproduction, as the individuals of each species.

All these are found in this world. To these may be added a fourth, viz., the angels in heaven. These are beings differing from man only in having an imperishable body.

To determine the question whether the human spirit is the

creature of the reproductive system, as is the organism or body ; whether it is dependent on this process of creation or not for its existence ; whether it is separated from the spirit of the parent as an individual being, as the individual fertilized cell is from the organism of the parent, and when it is fertilized and becomes the initial point of the future being ; it is necessary that we should understand somewhat the design of the reproductive system and the scope of its operations, whether everything that is found in the individual of the species is reproduced.

IV.

I.—*The Design of the Reproductive System.*—This system is not concerned in the creation or origination of the species of organized beings. This is the immediate act of God, a pure creation ; no secondary agent intervening as a cause. It is concerned alone, as its name implies, in the multiplication of individuals of each species, for the purpose of continuing the species on the earth after the death of the original pair. This is done by the process of reproduction, and so exact and invariable is this process—a process of the living organism, common to plants and animals—that the remotest individual is just as exact and perfect a reproduction of the original as those that belong to the first generation. On this fact is based the immutability of species. But it is pertinent and important to the question under consideration to know what constitutes species.

It must be remembered that classification is the work of the human mind, and that it is effected by grouping together the features of individuals which are common to the greatest number, and which are known to be permanent and constant. Whatever is variable and contingent is discarded ; for this would forbid even the supposition that species are immutable. The permanent and constant only are taken, and these are regarded as typical elements which, together, constitute the type of organism. In the type of organism only are species immutable. Typical elements only are invariably reproduced ; these only are certainly derived from parent to offspring. That which is contingent and variable of the individual may or may not appear in the offspring.

They are, therefore, no proof of parentage, and none, consequently, that they are derived. They may vary infinitely, and yet not obscure in the least the species, as is strikingly and wonderfully exemplified in the human species, in which we have the widest differences in variety. Besides the wonderful and strange variety in the races of this species, scarcely two individuals among any of the varieties are found to resemble either in their physical or psychical features, so that nothing can be inferred in regard to what is reproduced or derived, from that which is variable and contingent. No system of classification can be based on accidental and variable features of the organism; nor could species be declared immutable if these accidents were made the basis of classification. Only that which is permanent and constant in individuals can distinguish them as a species, or be regarded as typical. Yet all these impossibilities must exist, and become rational, if the argument of your correspondent is not the wildest vagary of a disordered imagination. That argument is, that, since "children resemble their parents in mind, disposition, strength, character, and in other respects;" and since the body is derived, and physical features are reproduced, therefore the spirit, to which, it is assumed, belong the mind and disposition, is also derived with the organism. He assumes that the psychical natures of animals is an inherent element of their organism, and this we are willing to grant, and yet will deny that the spirit being in man is the same, an element of his organism. E. must first demonstrate that the spirit is an element of his organism, before he can hope to make it plausible that the human spirit is derived from the spirit of the parent, as the body is from the body. In this case it would constitute a typical element, and show that it was such by permanent and constant psychical faculties, and not by mere accidental resemblances, as the evanescent features of the body or of the mind.

V.

II.—*Psychical Faculties*.—These, in the animal, are organic; that is, they belong to and are developed with the organism, being developed *pari passu* with the development of the organism, increasing in number and capacity as they approach the human

type, in which the animal organism becomes perfect in all elements, and in which the organic series ends, and the psychical faculties reach their perfection. So far as these faculties depend on the organism are they exactly reproduced; but so far as the play of these faculties is concerned, so far as the turn the mind may take in showing this or that disposition, this strength or that weakness, or this character or that, all these are the purest accidents, and are no more constant than the varieties of a species, depending sometimes on causes too occult for us to detect or even to conjecture. Hence nothing can be inferred from accidental resemblances between parent and offspring in the particulars mentioned. They are not relevant to this subject, and can as readily prove that the Jew is the son of Japheth, as that the human spirit is derived with the organism.

E. assumes that animals have spirits in the sense in which it is said that man has a spirit; that is, a spirit-being distinct and independent of the body; and then asserting that the spirits of beasts are derived with their organism, which he feels confident no one will deny, the conclusion is easy that the spirit of man is also derived. This is a quiet way of reaching such a conclusion. But the assumption is too glaring to deceive. It will not do to quote Solomon as proof, when he speaks of beasts having spirits: "The spirit of the beast that goeth downward," in contrast with "the spirit of man that goeth upward." E. is deceived by words, and hence confounds ideas. Solomon saw the utter annihilation of the being of beasts, and described this by saying that their "spirit goeth downward," the course we conceive anything to take when destroyed; but man he saw living after the death of the animal part of his being, and ascending upward. What can such language show, but that Solomon regarded man as possessing a being distinct and independent of his animal organism?

No one denies to animals the possession of psychical faculties, and that these are the same in kind as those possessed by man. And it is also admitted that these faculties are of the organism, and derived with it. But if this be so, it must be equally true that they must perish with the organism. All that is derived is of the organism, and must be as perishable as the organism. So far

as man is animal all this is true of him, and will as certainly befall him. Hence, to say that the spirit of a beast and of man are not distinguishable, is virtually to make man a beast, or the beast a man. The fact that man possesses a more enlarged capacity of every faculty than animals only distinguishes him as an animal species, not as a being of a distinct category; for animals differ among themselves in regard to their psychical capacity. This is only the result of a difference of species. If man is to be distinguished categorically from animals, this difference must rest on a basis not found in animals, whatever this basis may be. And whatever it is, differing as it does so much from the animal organism as to be distinct and separable from it, it can not be derived with the organism.

Nor is the possession of psychical faculties by beasts any evidence that they have a spirit like that in man. It proves only that there is in animals a spirit nature, but in what form must be determined by other facts. There can be no doubt that psychical faculties, whether in man or animals, have their foundation in spirit; that psychical phenomena are peculiar to spirit; for mind is the peculiar attribute of spirit and of nothing else, so far as our knowledge extends. Mind in animals, mind in man, and mind in God, is essentially the same, and a positive proof of the existence of spirit. All this is fully believed, and hence admitted. But if the being of animals perish utterly, are we not warranted in saying that the form in which spirit appears in them is impersonal, and hence may be organic or derived with the organism? But if man does not utterly perish; if something remains of him after the death of his body; that which thus lives must for this reason be personal. Hence, on the hypothesis that man lives after the death of his body, the difference between the spiritual nature of man and of beasts must exist in the form in which spirit appears in them.

If, on the contrary, man does not differ in category from animals, and if he is, by virtue of the nature of his being, immortal, then must animals also be immortal in their nature. Such an irrational conclusion shows that man is categorically distinct from animals, and hence that which is distinct from the organism can not be derived with it.

The argument now stands thus : The reproductive system which gives to the animal organism its derived nature, proposes no more, and accomplishes no more than the reproduction of the typical elements of the organism. That which is not a typical element, which is not a part of the organism, can not, in the nature of things, be reproduced. If, therefore, the human spirit be distinct from and independent of the organism, it can not for this reason be derived. It is impossible that that which lives after the annihilation of the organism should be derived with it. Has the process of reproduction the power to grasp a foreign element, and incorporate it with the organism, so that it may be a part of the organism during the life of the organism, and yet live after the body has utterly perished ? If so, species could not be immutable, nor could there be any such distinctions in the organic world as now obtains.

VI.

The conclusion developed by this branch of the argument can not, I think, be successfully met ; and yet it is made still more evident by the other branch of the argument, that which relates to the spirit.

That the spirit of man in some sense is created can scarcely be doubted ; yet, as to its essence, it must be uncreated, since it is the nature of God. As finiteness inheres in all created beings, the human spirit must be a created being, since it is finite in all the faculties and powers of its being. It may seem strange to us that that which is, in its essence, uncreated, can become a created and finite being. Yet such, we must admit, is the fact in case of the human spirit, which, as a distinct personal being, must be finite and created, is, at the same time, as to its essence, the same as the uncreated divinity.

Admitting that, in some sense, the human spirit is a created being, distinctly personal and individual, we are now to determine, if possible, the nature of its creation ; whether it is primary or secondary ; whether it is by an immediate and direct act of God, or by some mediate, secondary, and indirect process, such as is concerned in the multiplication of individuals of the animal species ? I am now considering the creation of the spirit without any reference to the organism ; and,

1. Is it said to be created because it dwells in a created organism? That created organisms impose finiteness on spirit-beings while they are united to the organism, may be regarded as true; but it can not be the only cause; for, were this so, the incarnate *Logos* would have been as weak and feeble as a man. The cause of man's finiteness must be sought for elsewhere than in his organism, however great the degree with which it may impress finiteness upon the human spirit. This cause can be none other than the created nature of the spirit; and hence,

2. It may be said to be created, because it is a person, an individual, and finite in and of itself.

We may now ask: Is the human spirit made a personal, an individual spirit-being by God, or by the reproductive process, as a secondary cause in the hands of God? I am ready to affirm the truthfulness of the first, and the falseness of the latter; and I argue,

1. From its distinctly personal and individual character, and its capability of living independently of the organism after it has perished, and of being again invested with an immortal body; and,

2. From the nature of the reproductive process. And, first, the personal and individual character of the human spirit. That the spirit of man is a personal, individual being, is a fact of revelation, can not be questioned by any one who believes in the divine character of that revelation; for the Scriptures declare that the spirit of man lives after the death of the body; that it is not destroyed in the destruction of the body. This fact Christ himself recognizes when he counsels men as to whom they should fear, and by the apostle, when speaking of the nature of the body with which man shall be invested at the resurrection. Paul clearly had before his mind at this time the disembodied spirit, and its investment with an imperishable body. It must be particularly noted that the apostle is speaking of the body, and not of the spirit. His language leaves no room for doubt; for he says: "there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body." The first the organism in which he now dwells, and the other the body in which he will dwell in heaven forever. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the human spirit is a personal and an individual being, while in a disembodied state.

The nature of his heavenly body further demonstrates the truth of this statement. That body is immortal. The spirit must, therefore, be immortal also. Whence this immortality of the spirit? The materialists say that the spirit is made immortal at the resurrection, all others that it is inherently immortal. It matters not now which view is the true one; in either case there is the idea of an independent being, wholly spirit, which is invested at the resurrection with an immortal body. The nature of the body will conform then to the nature of the spirit; for it would be absurd to suppose that an immortal body should invest a mortal spirit. But when we remember that the spirit is immortal because of its intrinsic nature, the propriety and necessity of an immortal body become perfectly apparent.

As the human spirit is a personal and individual being, and its essence identical with that of the Divinity, its creation must consist solely in the individualization of spirit—in the formation of spirit into individual, personal beings. Whether there is such a substance in the universe as impersonal spirit, independent of God, from which spirit-beings are created, is more than we know. Still we must conceive, it seems to me, that spirit-beings, such as the disembodied spirit of man, can become persons only by the individualization of spirit, which, in its essence, is uncreated. But by what process is scarcely conceivable by us, as there is nothing analogous to it on the earth, unless it be the creation of living organisms out of the matter of this world; but this analogy fails, because we do not know that there is such a substance as impersonal spirit, as there is of impersonal matter.

VII.

Regarding the human spirit as a personal, individual being, we now inquire when and how it became such? The answers given to these important questions by your correspondent E. are, that the human spirit originated with and in the animal organism; and by you, that it is a distinct, special, and independent creation by God, having no genetic or derivative connection with the organism. If you are correct—and I think that facts and philosophy will bear you out in the statement,—then the human spirit

must have an existence independent of the organism ; whether prior, coeval, or subsequent to its existence, it matters not, so far as the argument is concerned. The Scriptures make it positively certain that the spirit can and will exist independently of the body, in a disembodied state ; and if it can and will, and this because of its inherent nature, there is little difficulty in believing that this nature has kept it distinct and separable from the body from the moment of its creation ; so that it can have no derivative connection with the organism in its origin. This conclusion will be still more apparent when we have considered,

II.—*The Nature of the Reproductive Process.*—This process has been studied with wonderful minuteness and accuracy in the higher plants and in the eggs of some animals, such as fishes, turtles, and birds. The microscope has revealed the wonders of this minute and invisible world. It has revealed the process by which the individuals of species are indefinitely multiplied, and their race thus prolonged on the earth. The foundation of this process is the specialization of a cell on the part of each parent, in and from the organism. When contact between these cells takes place, then changes begin in the fertilized cell, which finally terminates in the production of a new cell, and this new cell becomes the initial point of the future being. This cell is developed in contact with the living organism, until it is capable of an independent existence, in the case of animals, when it may be considered that the future being is perfect, though not fully and completely developed in regard to every feature of its organism. These specialized cells can not be originated by any process but that which is of and belongs to the organism, nor elsewhere than in the organism. They are wholly the result of the vital force of the organism through special organs, and formed from the living current, the source whence the supply for the formation and maintenance of all structures is derived, so that what was never in the blood can never become a part of the organism, or have any connection with it. This being so, what are we to say of the derived origin of the human spirit, a distinct, personal, and individual being, which will live when the existence of the animal organism has been almost erased by time from the memory ? Has the re-

productive process, that is confessedly confined in all of its operations to the living organism, the power and organs by which it can grasp, and incorporate in the organism it is forming, a being superior to the organism it creates, and as distinct in nature as any two things can be? Can it absorb spirit from the great fountain of spirit, and mould it by its organs into an individual being, capable of outliving the organism, and dwelling in a sphere of the universe of which it is not a force, and with which it has no connection? Such is not the range and compass of the process of reproduction. Its creatures are formed from organic and inorganic material, which embrace nothing in their being that is not purely organic. The spirit of a man is not a necessary and indispensable part or element of the animal organism, because it is absent from all animals below man. The animal organism is perfect and complete without it; and unless it be affirmed that the reproductive process has the power to embrace and incorporate that which is not a part or an element of the organism, the human spirit can have no derivative connection with the organism in its origin. The human spirit, therefore, owes its existence to the direct and immediate act of God, every spirit being as special a creation of God as the original pair of every species.

If the human spirit is not an immediate and direct creation of God, is it a creation of a reproductive system for spirit-beings?

It seems to be the conception of those who believe in the derived nature of the human spirit, that the reproductive system embraces the spirit as well as the body; that spirit-beings are reproduced from spirit-beings, as organized beings are from organized beings; that the existence of the human spirit is as truly dependent on a spirit-reproductive system as the organism is dependent on the organic system of reproduction; so that the creation of the spirit is coeval with the creation of the body, the respective reproductive processes acting at one and the same time.

The reproductive process of the organic system is clearly one of growth. The fertilizing and fertilizable cell of the higher orders of living organisms are produced, though they may never be brought into contact; and their production is as truly a growth as the cell of any of the structures of the organism. In

some lower orders of animals and vegetables the growth character of the reproductive is made apparent to our observation, in the processes of reproduction called fissiparous and gemmiparous, the first by subdivision and the latter by budding.

It must be observed that we can have no conception of a reproductive process different from those concerned in the multiplication of individuals of animal and vegetable species. We know not that a reproductive system exists elsewhere in the universe than on this earth. If there were we could have no conception of that mode of creation if it differed from the reproductive process of this world. Hence, if there be a reproductive system for spirit as well as for matter, we must conceive its process to be the same as that of which we have knowledge.

It must be further observed that the reproductive system is concerned in the production of organized beings, and that organized beings have a very complicated nature and constitution. Such a system can not act on pure and simple matter. This reproductive process can not exist in a simple element of the inorganic world. It can not exist in any pure and simple substance. This being indisputable, it can not exist in spirit, and hence spirit-beings can not be multiplied or created by any such process.

VIII.

The growth character of the reproductive process clearly forbids the idea of a reproductive system existing for spirit. Spirit-beings do not grow as organized beings. The conception we have of the nature of spirit, cloudy as that conception is, does not allow us to conceive of these beings having their initial point in so minute a structure as an organized cell, and growing from this point to the perfect stature of its species. If this were so, we would have spirit-beings in the spirit world of every stature at which the human race has died, from infants to giants. This conception is too material to be entertained for a moment. The growth of spirit-beings is like the growth of mind; and although we speak of large and small minds, these words are not used in their physical sense, as indicating material measurement. Hence, although we speak of great and mighty spirits, and conceive of

angels as excelling each other, we do not conceive of them as distinguished by physical stature. The idea of growth, therefore, as this word is used in reference to organized beings, must be discarded as applicable to spirit-beings.

As we can not conceive of this process of the reproductive system as applicable to spirit-beings, can we conceive of these beings as being generated from the parent's spirit by other modes of the reproductive process? Can we conceive of them as being produced by fissiparous and gemmiparous reproduction? If not by the cell-mode, then certainly not by these; for these are as truly generated by the growth process as the cell-form. Can we conceive of a spirit being budding from the spirit of the parent in the same manner and at the same time that the organized animal initiates its being and proceeds on its growth? This would be to materialize spirit. Or can we conceive the spirit as being separated from the spirit of the parent by the subdivision of the parent's spirit? Such a conception also materializes spirit; for it implies the property of divisibility, which is a more purely material process than the growth of organized beings. No conception that we have of the reproductive system for organized beings will tolerate the hypothesis of a similar system existing for spirit-beings. We must, therefore, discard the idea of the human spirit being created by a system of reproduction.

In the light of these facts it is the wildest fancy to suppose, because children sometimes resemble their parent in the strength, character, and disposition of mind, that the human spirit, from which it is assumed these phenomena alone arise, is derived; that the spirit of the child proceeds as truly from the spirit of the parent as does the organism from the body. This is to reason from the variable to the constant, from the evanescent to the permanent, and from the contingent to the necessary, than which nothing dignified with the name of reasoning can be more absurd.

The obvious difficulty that lies in the way of these materialists relate to the time when the spirit, if a creation distinct from the organism, takes possession of the body. Can any one tell when the *Logos* took possession of his body? The difficulty presented is no greater in the case of man than in the case

of the *Logos*. Hence this difficulty is no argument for the derived nature of the human spirit. In the case of the *Logos* we know the fact, but can give no solution of the question as to the time when the God and the man became one. Our remediless ignorance on this subject should not weigh a feather with such facts and considerations as have been here presented. It is the duty of reason to adopt that view of a subject which accounts for all the facts and phenomena connected with it, and this, I submit, is done only by the view of man's nature here maintained. C.

A TRIP TO MISSOURI.—In my recent short trip to Missouri, I learned much as to the state of the cause; and what I learned left my spirit sad. In that large State, where we once had so fine a foothold, decline lies like a mildew on the work of the past. Our churches now are not what they once were. Then they were united, prosperous, and full of vitality. All this can not be said of them now. Many of them are nobly struggling to regain their former high position; but their progress is slow. Two deeply felt wants interfere with their benevolent wishes. First, the want of money; and, second, the want of preachers. The latter want they profoundly feel. It positively pained me to hear them mourn over the absence of the preachers they once so tenderly loved, and who are with them no more. "Brother Lard, is there no chance to get you all to come back?" was the one question which had stereotyped itself on every lip. I hung my head low, when I heard that question, so full of heart and sadness; for the answer was not on my tongue. Countless times during my short stay, did I hear the names of Bro. Hopson, Bro. Wilkes, Bro. McGarvey, and Bro. Haley. Not once did I hear inquiry made for a new man. Their old preachers they wanted back. But the great difficulty is, that their old preachers have not in themselves the means to live; and the brethren in Missouri have it not to give them. My prayer is, that God may yet bring to pass the desire of his children there. A better day may yet dawn on them.

MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

I.

THE discussions on the subject of Missionary Societies have been, it seems to me, conducted with less solemn regard for the Scriptures, with less attention to the demands of logical inquiry, and with still less concern for the feelings of opponents respectively, than have characterized the efforts of our brethren on any other subject. It is conceded that there have been some exceptions to this; but they were *exceptions*. Sharp, angular expressions of thought I love. Logical points made clear, and even severe, I admire. This all, when it arises from a supreme desire to glorify God, is praiseworthy. But when wit, sarcasm, and the logical implements are used, as they have too often been, simply for the placing of an opponent in an awkward dilemma, I claim that the purpose has been too low a one for a Christian philosopher, and that the labor has been lost for good.

Too often have both parties started out, apparently without any well-defined principles from which reliable conclusions might be reached. The results have been, in the majority of instances, such as might have been expected. No conclusion is reached. No practical good is accomplished. Strifes are gendered, and the servants of the Lord strive as they ought not. If any one has a doctrine on the subject before us, clear to his mind and of vital importance, let him by all means give it to us. But let the lesson fall upon us as the "precious ointment upon the head," "as the dew of Hermon, as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion, for there the Lord commanded the blessing." Let us have conclusions, strong, that, Gibraltar-like, will stand amid the winds, and tempests, and beating storms that may oppose. I love, and so does every one, to see a conclusion clad in Heaven's armor, and guarded well by that which is sharper than any two-edged sword—the word of God.

The defects in former efforts which I have suggested may

by no means be avoided here, but the attempt to avoid them must be held to be legitimate and not presumptuous.

Nearly all of those who have written in defense of Missionary Societies have admitted, nay, declared, that they are "human expedients," claiming for them neither precept nor precedent from the Holy Scriptures. Those in the negative hold, with the affirmants, that the Scriptures do not authorize in any way the Societies, and for this reason oppose them. Thus we may conclude that the brethren do generally decide, almost unanimously indeed, that the Societies are human expedients, and not divine institutions. Are they therefore wrong? Not necessarily, I think. It is not true that a Christian man is disallowed to do everything that is not commanded in the Scriptures, or that is entirely unknown to them. He may do many such things, and rightly too. Nay, he must do *some* such things. But while this is true, it is equally so that there are things that he can not do without just cause of offense against God and his brethren. Now it does seem to me that there is a principle or rule which we can and ought to reach, by which all the things lawful can be known and included among the things which we may do, and that by the same rule the unlawful things may be excluded.

If we had such a rule, sharp and clear, we would have but to bring the Societies to this standard, and the proper conclusion would result and stand out as beautifully as Chimborazo's snow-clad summit, reflecting the meridian rays of a tropical sun.

Let us try for such a rule, under a few hypotheses.

1. Nothing, for the furtherance of the gospel shall be allowed for which we can not find the authority in the word of God. This plea is sometimes, I think, set up by the opponents of the Societies. Is it a valid one? I think it is most obviously and glaringly false. The spread of the gospel may, and often does, depend very materially upon whether a man shall walk or ride. Riding on horseback and in a carriage are both open to the preacher. The Bible does not say which he shall take. But he must determine for himself, and on the decision which he shall make may depend the success of the truth at a given place. That is, this is a case where a choice of means for spreading the gos-

pel must be made by men left to consult their own common sense. The duty of making a choice in such case being imperative and lawful, man must choose, and he is innocent. The same is true of a great many other questions that may and do arise. Thus I conclude that our first hypothesis is not true.

2. But may we use any and every appliance for the spread of the gospel, or for the conversion of sinners that we think will accomplish the end ; or, if you choose, will best accomplish it ? May we, subscribing heartily to the object, as being sacred and right, adopt any and every strategy and scheme, which, because we have tried it, or have known it to be tried, we believe will work well ? This certainly can not be true. The mourner's bench and infant sprinkling stand erect and firm on this platform. It is not contended that there is authority for the mourner's bench in the word of God. But "it has been tried and found to work well ; therefore it may be used if we wish." Infant sprinkling was, in the first instance by Irenæus, and finally by Beecher, placed upon this same ground. These institutions, it is claimed, have been tried and found to work well, and upon this ground they claim the right, feeling it a duty, doubtless, to use them. They must convert sinners, must so bring the gospel to bear upon their minds and hearts as to turn them to God ; and after the most patient, prayerful, and protracted study, and after long experience, they determine that infant rantism, tends greatly to accomplish the end desired. Therefore, by the rule on which they act, and which they have assumed to be right, that whatever tends to the conversion of sinners may be, nay, if the best means that can be devised, must be adopted, they rantize the little ones in the name, as they suppose, of the Lord. Now, remembering our hypothesis, how can any one who shall adopt it object to the mourner's bench, or to infant sprinkling ? If the Societies can not come in under anything better than this hypothesis, they must stay out, or the door is open wide enough to allow entrance to every bad scheme that any uncircumcised clan, sect, or party may devise. But is it objected that God has authorized things with which the above practices would be incompatible, and that it is, on this account alone, that the mourner's bench, etc., must be objected to ?

Let us admit this to be true ; still it does not follow that the deduction from the premises is illogical, but only that the premises are unduly assumed, plainly, that the rule is wrong. We conclude, then, that while it is true that the rule which says: Nothing for the furtherance of the gospel shall be practiced for which we can not find a thus saith the Lord, is false, it is equally true that the rule which says: Any and every thing may be done that is believed to be best adapted to accomplish the end desired, is false also. If we are right thus far, then the conclusion is legitimate and true, that some things may be done for the conversion of sinners, for which the Bible does not furnish us the law, and yet not everything which we might think expedient and useful may be adopted.

Whether either party has fully and consistently occupied the position assigned it in the foregoing suppositions or not, is not here affirmed ; but it is believed that each one has leaned too much each to his own.

"The Missionary Societies" can not be excluded by the former rule, for it is false ; nor can they be defended on the ground of the latter rule, for it is false also. Now by what just rule can Missionary Societies be defended ? Or, if they can not be defended, by what just rule must they be condemned ?

II.

Our Missionary Societies are certainly not commanded expressly, nor are they expressly forbidden, in the Scriptures. Are they by implication either commanded or forbidden ? I believe both parties would say yes, to this question. Then I insist that each one should state the text or texts of the Scriptures upon which the implication rests, and from which it follows as a necessary conclusion. While this work is before them no other should engage a moment's thought.

In order to elicit the truth in request let us submit the following : 1. When any duty is devolved upon us in the Bible, and the mode of discharging the obligation is prescribed therein, then the following of the given prescription is the only way to discharge the obligation. 2. When any duty is prescribed in the Bible, and

the manner or plan of performing it is not given, then whatever means we may think will best accomplish the object, though human expedients, may be, nay, must be adopted. Both parties will subscribe heartily to both the foregoing propositions, I presume, without the change of a word ; certainly they will with unimportant verbal changes. 3. The duty, which rests somewhere, is the preaching of the gospel. This is prescribed, so that he who preaches anything else shall be accursed ; and this, simply, as I suppose, because God says : "Go preach the gospel." Both parties, I suppose, will agree to this third proposition. 4. The duty of preaching the gospel, and therefore of converting sinners, is by the appointment of God laid upon the church. The advocates of the Societies, and the most distinguished one among them too, have and do unhesitatingly so declare themselves. I take it to be the faith of the party as such. Their opponents believe the same thing.

From these four postulates, never by any held in doubt, it follows, that the preaching of the gospel is the thing to be done, and that the church is the divinely commissioned agent to do it. And also, that if the plan of doing the work is given, that plan must be followed ; but if it is not given, then the church is to make a plan.

Now the work before the Society brethren is, to my mind, very clear. They must, if these Societies are to be received as truly the agents of God for the spread of the gospel, show : First, that the Societies are the church ; or, second, that God has commissioned them, as his agents, distinct from the church, to have the gospel preached ; or, third, that the church has authority from God for transferring the responsibility in whole or in part to these Societies, and that it has done it. I say to *these* Societies ; for unless it be shown that this transfer may be made to them by name, or in a way that shall distinctly mark them out, may it not be, that, if the transfer may be made at all, it may be made to any other human organizations on earth as well as to them ? The third proposition will, I suppose, be rejected by all. The second has, so far as I know, never been defended by any one. Not a few have failed altogether to make clear the grounds upon which they would defend the Societies. At times they have been

thought to be in harmony with the spirit of the gospel, and therefore right. Again: they have been defended on the ground that they were useful; it being assumed that whatever is useful must be right. But the best thinkers on the affirmative side have assumed, or rather tried to show, that the Societies, or some of them at least, are the church in some sense, and that it is on this account that they are responsible for the preaching of the gospel.

It is contended that the church is both universal and particular. That "the duty of the local is more for the necessities and enjoyments of its own life, than for the conversion of the world. It is designed to give organic strength and permanence to the body of the disciples. It (the local church) stands to the wider public operations of the church universal, as the agricultural class in political states does to the mercantile and commercial." Here it is plainly taught that the duty of having the gospel preached is devolved mainly upon the church universal. It is also taught that the Societies complement this notion of a universal church; else, though it were true that the universal church is God's commissioned agent to have the gospel preached, it would not follow that the Societies have any warrant from this fact. But the lesson does not stop with this conclusion. It proceeds to inform us that the local churches are not particularly burdened with the duty of converting the world; that its principal work lies in a very different direction. The author of the language quoted, after giving us the appropriate work of the respective churches, proceeds to define the relation that exists between them. The local is to the universal, as the agricultural class is to the mercantile and commercial. That is, the local churches everywhere are to act for the universal church, *alias* Missionary Societies, as bases of supplies, or as fulcrums for the exertion of power. Several texts are cited to show that there is a universal church, and they are probably quite in point, but it is by no means true that any one of them, or all of them together, sustains or even suggests the notion that God has committed to the church universal, exclusive of the idea of local churches in the aggregate, the duty of preaching the gospel. Such a relation of the local churches to the universal church is taught nowhere in reason nor Revelation. It is simply untrue,

I am sure. If such a view were presented as a mere speculation, as the opinion of man, it might be comparatively harmless. But when it is insisted that such is the teaching of God's word on one of the gravest points in all the Holy Scriptures, I must think the lesson dangerous, extremely so.

That the church universal has any organic existence, or was intended to have, is not apparent to me; nor do I believe that it is to any one. If it has, then it is a divine institution, and we should expect to find its metes and bounds, its offices, its laws of life and growth, and its distinct name. For all these it must have, in order to be a distinct organized institution. But it has not these things, and is not, therefore, such an institution. Is not the effort, then, to organize any society that shall be held and treated as the church universal, wrong? Besides, it is allowed by every writer of note on the affirmative and on the negative sides of the question, that the Societies are human expedients. They can not, then, be the church in any sense; for *it* is in every sense divine. At least, this is true of the church of God. More generally; the church universal is either organized, or it is not. If it is, it is divine; whereas the Societies are not. If it is organized, then the work being done, or at least the constitution and laws of its life and growth being given in the Bible, it is childlike for us to meet together and proceed to make, ourselves, a constitution and laws. If there is no law for the organic existence of the church universal, then it has not and ought not to have any such existence.

If men should make the law which gives life and power to any institution it seems most improper to give the name, universal church of God, to it. Now suppose that we conclude that the universal church is not organized, then, as before said, the effort to give it an organic existence is all wrong. It seems to me that the advocates of Missionary Societies have an idea of the church universal about such as sectarians have of the invisible church, and for about the same reason. A sectarian does not claim that his church is a church of Christ in the sense that the church at Corinth was a church of Christ; but that it is a branch of the invisible church. If you ask him where that church is, of which his is a branch, the answer, invented by Luther when hard pressed and not knowing what to say, is, "It is invisible."

There is, I think, in nearly all the Missionary Societies, a provision which allows any one, saint or sinner, to become member or director, who shall pay over a given sum of money.

Evidently, then, if these Societies are the church in any sense, it is a mere accident. The number of sinners that might contribute the required sum might at any time be greater than the number of the saints so contributing. It would certainly not look much like the church of God in such event. Is it said that this is not at all likely to happen? But it can not be denied but that the invitation is broad enough; so, if it does not happen, it is not the fault of the Societies. In fact, this state of the case does exist to an extent sufficiently great to forbid the idea that the Societies are the church of God in any sense.

But suppose the Societies should provide that their every member must be a member of some local church, in good standing; this circumstance would not constitute them the church of Christ, universal or particular. There is, I grant, a sense in which a mere assembly of disciples is a church; but it is equally true that in that sense of the word any assemblage of persons, for any purpose whatever, and of whatever character, is a church. And besides all this, the very most that could rightly be claimed for any assembly of Christians in their individual capacity, in one place, is that it is a church *pro tempore*, and not that it is the church universal at all.

But suppose we knew, which we do not, for it is not true, that the Societies or any one of them is the church universal, organized to that extent, how do we know what its lawful work is? Is it scripturally designated to be the spread of the gospel, either as its whole work, or as a part included in the whole? Then, of course, the passage should be cited that so declares. But this has not, I believe, ever been attempted. If it be advanced as the opinion of some friend of the Societies, then its logical force is set aside by the opinion of some others against it.

Let us approach another phase of this subject. But let us not come with a flourish of trumpets: "That we are not troubled with conscientious scruples as are others; that we are ready to assert our individual Christian liberty; that we must expand be-

yond the circle of local, individual churches," etc. It seems to me that a Christian man ought to rejoice in the possession of a very sensitive conscience, one that trembles at the word of God, and scruples long before accepting a human mode or scheme for accomplishing the prime work for which the Savior died.

One party says: Though we have no text of Scripture clearly authorizing our Societies, yet they are in "harmony with the spirit and tenor of the Scriptures." The other party denies this. Let us look at the issue. I fear that conclusion which can stand only upon "the spirit and tenor of the Scriptures." The reference to the Scriptures in such cases indicates the felt necessity that the conclusion desired should be based upon the word of God; and the fact that nothing more nor better can be cited in its support than "the spirit and tenor of the Scriptures," is evidence, to my mind, of one's being reduced to great extremities. The principle of attempting to sustain conclusions by such premises is a dangerous one, to say the least of it. Quoting from one whose intimate knowledge of the *Magna Charta* of Christian liberty entitles his words to much consideration, let me say: that "God is the only lawgiver, speaking either in person or through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. All we have to do is to discharge our (prescribed) duty. It is his to command, ours to obey. If we are commanded to go, and no definite way is marked out, we must rise up and find a way—if necessary, cut a way—for go we must."

Yes, we must go, for we are commanded to "go preach the gospel to every creature," and it must be done. Every Christian, alive to his duty, feels it. And each such one will, to the extent of his ability, do it. If he finds no "definite way marked out," he will and ought to find a way of his own—if necessary, "cut a way." Here the brethren in the negative, generally, in the discussions of this question are fairly entitled to the affirmative, and are bound to show that God has revealed the way in which the gospel is to be carried to the people or the agency by which it is to be done, or yield the question. The work is commanded, and surely, if the way is not marked out, it is our duty to make a way. Or more plainly, if the Lord has not designated the agents by

which the gospel is to be preached, or the institution through which, then it is our duty to make the best one we can ; that is, Missionary Societies are right ; they are necessities. Has the Lord given us the way ?

III.

It would seem strange that God should have left us a great work to do, and should have given us no direction as to the manner of doing it. I believe that he intended, and that he has required, that the church should be his agency for converting the world. I shall now submit a few reasons for so believing. 1. I think the Savior intended to be so understood when he said : " On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of the unseen shall not prevail against it." Here the powers of darkness are said to be against the church. But it must be supposed that these powers are especially and pre-eminently against that institution through which the gospel is preached for the defeat of Satan's kingdom. It follows, then, that the Savior either taught in this passage, or took it for granted as a thing well understood, that the agent for converting the world is the church. If it be replied that the word church is here used in its general sense, I may admit it, though I see no reason for doing so. But with this admission, I shall deny that the general sense of the word is anything different from that which includes the particulars. That is, the church general is simply and only the churches local or particular. With this view the lesson is : The church, all and singular, is the agent of God for the conversion of the world. Whatever may be affirmed of any generic term may always be affirmed of its specifics. The specifics never contain less, generally more, than their generics ; so that whatever of comfort any persons may have derived from the idea that the word church is sometimes used in a generic sense, therefrom, as they suppose, deriving authority for Missionary Societies, which they could not obtain from the idea of local churches, is a mere delusion. If it be claimed that there are members of Christ's church general that are not and can not be members of any local church, the fact should be shown ere any conclusion therefrom should be attempted. I am inclined to deny

the fact. But, although I should grant that there are such members as do not belong to any local church, I think the cause of the Societies could derive no advantage therefrom. If such members can, and will not belong to some local church, to them it is a sin, and the Society brethren are not blessed in having them. If they can not belong to any local church, then, though innocent, their cases are exceptions to the rule, and so far from breaking, they rather establish it.

If it could be proved that there is a church general, independently of the local churches, it is at least a fact that neither Jesus nor his apostles ever gave it, or authorized it to have, any general organization; whereas they did establish local churches everywhere possible, to be the light of the world and the salt of the earth.

Thus the question of a general organized church seems to be decided in the negative. So that if the Societies claim to be the church general, organized for general purposes, or for any purpose indeed, then their work in this respect is against the wisdom of God, and therefore wholly wrong. If they do not claim to be the church general, nor yet the local churches in council together, then they are entirely human.

2. In the following quotation, I believe it is generally admitted that we have prophetic allusions to the "house of God, which is the church of the living God; and to the work which is divinely committed to it." "Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, the Lord hath shined." (Psalm l., 2.) "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say: Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Isaiah ii., 2-3. See also Micah iv., 2.) The prophetic allusion here is, I think, to something not then in existence, but that should come to pass in the "latter days." This something is said to be "the mountain of the Lord's house," "the house of the

God of Jacob," and "Zion," which, I doubt not, has reference to the church, its exaltation, and its work. From it—the church—the law was to, not simply start, but continue to "go forth," or abroad. It was to be the perfection of beauty; and out of it the Lord, the light of the world, was to shine in all his healing, saving power; which power is the gospel. (Rom. i., 16; 1 Cor. xv., 2.) Like cities exalted to the top of the mountains, Zion sits the light of the world. From her, and from her alone, are radiated the saving beams of Him who was and is the truth and the life.

Now I would not be understood as intimating that it is not the duty of every disciple, of every two who might be together, or of any number, at home or abroad, to preach and to teach, to spread the knowledge of salvation far and wide, as they should have opportunity. They must do so. The holy enthusiasm all aglow in the hearts of the saved, must, like the literal flame, have air; must have means of expansion, else it will die out. The man of God will and must, by his prayers, his tears, his holy conversations, exhortations, and instructions, constantly exhibit to and urge upon the attention of the lost the salvation of God. Nor is it necessary that he should be told or commissioned by the church to do it. It is his duty and privilege, because he is a child of God, independently of all thought of the church. Nay, more; it is the privilege, if not the duty, of that man who has just now come to the resolution to take Jesus' yoke upon him, and before he has done so, to say to others, "Come!"

But what we do mean is, that, so far as individual men are to strive for the spread of the gospel and the conversion of the world, in and through an institution organized and officered, with constitution and laws, it shall be done through the church.

3. Paul says: "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," etc. Here we have sundry characters brought to view; some for laying the foundation of the church; others for building thereon; some for planting; others for watering it. These all worked through and in the church. (1 Cor.

xii., 28), so far as they used an organization at all. Their labor was for the edifying of the body of Christ; that is, they worked to build up the body of Christ—the Church. This building up the church consisted, doubtless, in large part, in converting sinners. The work peculiar to the original setting up of the church being finished, we have no apostles and prophets now, in the sense in which these words are most probably used in the passage. But the church still needs building up; needs to be taught, disciplined, etc.; and for these works it still needs, and has, by divine order, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. According to nearly every commentator, it is agreed that the duty of evangelists is, to recruit for the church, to enlist soldiers under the banner of the Captain of our salvation. The churches are, and every individual of them is, bound by a great law of the kingdom to see that not only the evangelist, but every other one is provided with the things needful for the body. And thus the whole body of Christ is bound together, each member to every other, and the entire body to every member thereof. It is thus that the “whole body, fitly joined together and compacted, and united by every helping joint, according to the energy in the measure of each part, makes increase of the body, for the building up of itself in love.” (Verse 17.) We here learn what should be the result of the work done by the parties before mentioned. Each member of the body is to be active, and to supply beauty, and strength, and efficiency to the body, according to the measure of energy which each one possesses, for the building up of itself in love. I do not believe that all this training, etc., of the members of the body is for the enjoyment of the body simply; but the manifest design of building up, compacting, and cementing the parts together in love, is that the body, the church, might, through the energy of its members, be God’s mighty power for the conversion of the world; or, as the Savior says: “That the world might believe.”

4. “But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth.” (1 Tim. iii., 15.)

In this passage we have it distinctly stated that the church is

"the pillar and support of the truth." The pillar and support, or firm foundation, are, in architecture, used to give fixedness and permanence to some superstructure, that the house, if you please, might serve permanently the purpose of its being built. These thoughts, when applied to the subject in hand, give us the following result : Just as the house would be comparatively valueless, and if a blessing, or useful at all, only temporarily so, without its pillars and supports, so the truth could not accomplish its mission of saving the sinner and comforting the saint but for the church. But this lesson becomes still more interesting when we take into the account, that the truth can not be said fairly to be supported unless it is made, by the support, to accomplish, as far as may be done, the object which it is designed to accomplish. Or thus : It is not true, according to any fair exegesis of the passage, that, because the truth has an existence, it is therefore sufficiently supported ; though this would be true, if simple existence would fulfill the design of God in respect to truth. But this is not so. God ordained the truth to enlighten the world, to bring it to Christ. He also ordained that men should preach it, and that they should live of it. With these elements before us, we draw the conclusion that when we have God's arrangement or plan, if you will, we shall have the gospel truth, not locked up, carefully preserved, but out on its mission of saving the lost of earth, supported by the church. I do not say that the truth is supported by the church as it ought to be, but only that God's plan is that it should be. Suppose the "pillar and support" be removed or not used, will the truth stand? Will it not, like the banner of some vanquished foe, trail in the dust? During the dark ages the truth was in existence, but it was in sackcloth. Then it had another custodian. And though it was preserved, was not killed ; it was not allowed to speak ; it was humiliated, in sackcloth. So it will be again, if ever another support is allowed to the truth than that one which God gave it. Indeed I believe, with some of the very best commentators, that this very idea was the one that the apostle had in his mind. In chapter iv., of 1 Timothy, the next verse but one to that one on which we are commenting, the apostle brings manifestly into view that other

organization which assumed to be the church—and as a human organization it is as good as any—and he warns Timothy to be careful how he conducts himself in the house of God—the church. That is, he would have him to be sure to set it in order just as commanded in the third chapter, and gives as the reason, that it is the pillar and support of the truth. It is not, therefore, inapposite that we should feel shy of any and every organization, except the church, that might assume the guardianship of the truth. Having set the house of God in order, Timothy was to commit the same things that he had learned from Paul to faithful men, who should be able to teach others also. (2 Tim. ii., 2.) And thus was the truth to be continued in the world, the power of God unto salvation to every one who would believe it.

IV:

But I may be asked : Why do you labor to prove what no one denies? Do not all those who are the friends of *Missionary Societies* admit that the church is God's *Missionary Society*? They certainly do at times seem to so admit. But if it is literally true that the church is God's only *Missionary Society*, why is another one made? Not only is another one made, but some brethren have been pretty soundly berated for not uniting with it and working in it; or, at least, they have been scolded sharply for opposing it, and continuing to support the truth through its God-given foundation—the church. An example of this sort is deserving of notice here, from the prominence of its author.

One of the most elegant writers of the times holds the following language: "We have come, as it were, to Kadesh-Barnea. The inviting land is before us, and a few, with bold hearts say, like Caleb and Joshua, Let us go up and take it. The Lord will be with us." This is, indeed, fine. But the following is most ungracious; and though it may intimidate some, will never convince or encourage any. "But many of our chief men and rulers see the sons of Anak in the way, and thus counsel the people to fear, and cry: 'Stone them with stones—those ambitious leaders that would persuade the church to its ruin,' and before this false alarm of infidelity; * * * in the paralysis of this pitiful cry of cra-

ven cowardice, we are halting, meditating retreat, looking for new leaders, and preparing to abandon the opening fields of gospel conflict and victory for the leeks and onions of Egypt." (*Harbinger*, 1866, p. 496.)

Let us believe that this was only a gentle unlimbering of the machinery of thought, that fancy might try her wing a little. It could not have been intended, and it is by no means true that the rank and file of those opposed to our present Missionary Societies, see, or even think they see, in the persons of their brethren, sons of Anak. But if they did, they are not the men to tremble, fear, halt, and prepare to abandon the opening fields of gospel conflict and victory. These scar-worn veteran soldiers of the cross, though not a whit more glorious in their record than their opponents, can not rightly be charged, when duty calls, with turning their backs upon the black serried ranks of Satan's hosts, within or without the camp. Indeed, and in a word, I doubt not for a moment but that the brethren on both sides of the present controversy are honestly and deeply impressed with the feeling of obligation to God, to glorify his name with their bodies and spirits which are his. If some are "scrupulous" as to the right or policy of adopting certain means for accomplishing an end, desired by all, what of it? Let us not see in it proof of what it does not prove—that any are insincere, but only that all are not infallible. Let us not in such cases turn our weapons upon each other, but rather let us state fairly and sharply the true issue, and then, in the light of the truth, see "whether these things are so."

That preachers were sent out by the churches, and were supported by them also; and that therefore, in the divine economy, the church is to have the gospel preached by sending out and supporting evangelists is shown still further by the following Scriptures. Acts xi., 22, and the connection, shows that some who were "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen," went to Antioch and spake the word of the Lord to the Grecians. The hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned to the Lord. Tidings of these things come to the ears of the church at Jerusalem, and they "sent Barnabas" to Antioch. "And much people was added to

the Lord." (Verse 24.) Barnabas and Paul spent a whole year at Antioch. After this the church at Antioch sent them on a mission to Salucia, Cyprus, Salamis, etc. (Acts xiii., 3.) After much labor and many glorious triumphs of the truth, they returned to the church at Antioch "from whence they had been commended to the grace of God, for the work which they fulfilled," and "rehearsed all that God had done with them." (Acts xiv., 27.) The work to which they had been commended was the preaching of the gospel, bringing members into the church, ordaining elders, etc. To this work the church sent them. True, the Holy Spirit sent them, but this fact presents no difficulty. (Col. i., 7.) Paul says that Epaphras was his fellow-servant. He preached, with Paul, the gospel. But it is also said: "Who is, for you, a faithful minister of Christ." Paul says (Col. i., 23,) that he was made a minister of the gospel. Moreover, he was rejoiced to suffer on "for *his* body's sake," which is the church, "of which he was made a minister." (Verses 24, 25.) The Philippians shined as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life." (Col. ii., 15, 16.) The Thessalonians sounded out the word of the Lord—the gospel—in Macedonia and Achaia, etc. (1 Thess. i., 8.) "The manifold wisdom of God," which, I think, certainly includes the gospel, was to be made known "through the church," even to the principalities and powers in heavenly places. The Syriac version reads, "by means of the church." (Eph. iii., 10.) 1 Pet. ii., 9, shows that those addressed by him were a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, etc., that they might show forth the praises of God. The object of their being separated from the world and constituted a holy nation—made a church—was that others should see the light and enjoy the salvation of God. The apostles, prophets, teachers, etc. (1 Cor. xii., 28), were all set in the church, the home of the saints, and the house of God, from which, and through which, and in which, all were and are to work.

Let it be remembered that all the master-workers with God and the under-workers for God, get their authority from him. They are bound to work because he requires it. Still it is the duty of the church to see that men go and preach the gospel; and

God makes it the duty of the church and of churches in co-operation to support the preacher.

It was the church that sent Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, and the church supported them, or "brought them on their way." (Acts xv., 2, 3.) It was the church at Jerusalem that received them. (Verse 4.) The church at Jerusalem sent messengers back to Antioch, who reported to the multitude, or to the church. (Verse 30.) Paul teaches (1 Cor. xvi., 6 ; and 2 Cor. x., 15, 16), that they of Corinth did and were bound to sustain him in preaching the gospel even in the regions beyond them. And such is the relation ordained to exist between the church and the one who preaches the gospel, that the former is obliged to sustain the latter, even in regions without their bounds. Such I suppose to be the rule now. Many churches did co-operate to relieve the poor saints at Jerusalem through messengers, some of which messengers were chosen by the churches to travel with Paul. (2 Cor. viii., 19-23.) Many other passages might be cited to the foregoing effect, but what has been said is deemed sufficient.

I have now called up the following points, and presented them with reasonable clearness and conclusiveness, I trust, viz., 1. That the spirit which has been manifested on both sides has not been all that it should have been. 2. That the Missionary Societies are human institutions, allowed to be such by their ablest and best friends ; but that they are not, therefore, necessarily wrong or inadmissible. 3. That the principle is, that if God has not appointed an organization through which the gospel is to be preached, nor ordained any definite plan by which it is to be done, and yet requires his people to have it done, then they may adopt any plan which they may conceive best suited to accomplish the end. But, on the other hand, if God has ordained an institution charged with the duty of preaching the gospel, then the Christian man is shut up to that one ; he may not make another. 4. The Societies are not the church. 5. The Societies have not a commission, as organizations distinct from the church, for preaching the gospel. 6. The church has no right to transfer its own obligations to another institution. 7. The Societies are not the church universal ; and if it were known that they are the

church universal, it is not known that the preaching of the gospel is the duty of said church, considered as something distinct from the local churches. 8. The brethren usually in the negative should assume the affirmative, and show that God has given, not a way, but *the* way, or else not think it strange that those who can see no divine plan should proceed to make one of their own. 9. I have tried to show that the church is the institution, so far as organized effort was ever designed, for the conversion of the world.

V.

But the cry comes from the four winds : If the church plan is God's plan, why does it not go to work and show its efficiency? I answer : This question may be put with equal pertinence and stinging effect to the friends of the Societies. They do but little. But they are so much opposed that they can not accomplish much, say their friends. This is true, no doubt. But the other side urges the same plea for the lack of results. My opinion is, that the reason why we do not do, as individuals, churches, and societies, tenfold more for the salvation of the world than we do, is because our own hearts are not in the spirit of making the sacrifice necessary. If we would seek the true remedy, then, we should begin at the seat of the disease ; not only at the individual churches, but at the individual members of them.

This work done, and in my opinion there could be no standing up against the ever-accumulating and overleaping force of the Christian enthusiasm that would everywhere exist. Sinners would be compelled to acknowledge that of a truth God is with this people. It is fruitless, and but complicates the question, and leaves its final solution all the more difficult, to attempt to legislate the evil away, by establishing human institutions. Though the means and mode of remedy are all divinely given, and are abundantly at hand, still, in a world of mind and moral freedom, it is optional with the sinner whether he will use the means that would make him the better man that he ought to be, or not. That is, the reason why the churches do not work as they ought is about the same as that any sinner fails to do right. A few good men can not do everything, though they should not relax their

energies nor be discouraged on that account. Let us make the tree good, then will the fruit be good. Let the churches be made what they ought to be, and then, I think, the world will have the light as far as it will receive it. But, finally, may not the churches co-operate? Nay, must they not? Certainly they may; and must, in some cases. Though I believe that the divine plan for the conversion of the world is to have established everywhere possible local churches, that shall be centres of power and attraction in the very midst of the enemy's country, and thus conquer; still I think it necessary, sometimes, to have the strength of many local churches concentrated, in order to establish some such centres. Ah! says one, then you have all the elements of a Missionary Society in such co-operation. Certainly, I grant, we have, for that is just what we want. The church is a Missionary Society. While these two things shall be kept convertible terms, it is all right. That is, while the Missionary Societies and the church or churches are the same thing, it is all right. It is only when such co-operation shall constitute itself into something which is not the church, a church, nor the churches, that it is wrong. But can the churches co-operate to any considerable extent, without forming some organization that shall be human, and not the church, a church, or all, or a part of the churches? If they can not, then the co-operation is clearly wrong. A church can send me, as its agent, anywhere it pleases, and I may be willing and able to go, to build up the cause or to preach the gospel. Suppose the church in Springfield, Ill., should desire to preach the gospel in Prince Edward's Island, may it not send me there to do it? Certainly. May it not require me to employ others to assist me? Certainly. May it not give me five hundred dollars, and direct me to go to Cincinnati to meet fifty others who may be there just as I am, to consult with them about sundry matters of interest in regard to such a work? Certainly. Might we not, there and then, determine to send two or more of our number, or to send some others, to the island to preach, promising them, as we were authorized to do, a reasonable compensation? Certainly. Might we not fix upon a time when we, or others who might be sent, would be there again on the same subject and by the same au-

thority? Certainly. But, says one, where is your text for delegating authority, by the churches, to another body? I would delegate no authority to another body, nor to any body. I would look at it as only several churches which, though complete in themselves, are no more than complete nor less than complete when acting together. Though there are many members, there is but one body. Whether there should be a half dozen or a dozen thousands together—and the more the better, provided their means of doing good is proportioned to the number—if they are but the finger ends of the churches reaching out and forth to do good, it is all right. But, says one, where is the text for all this? I answer: It is just where, for it is just that text which teaches that the church is to have the gospel preached. But again, it may be asked: How can these brethren who go to Cincinnati do anything without a president, secretary, treasurer, etc.? Of course they can do nothing without these. But the same is true of a church, and of every body of people acting together to accomplish a common object. Such a co-operation we have not, so far as I know, anywhere. The idea of life-memberships and life-directorships would, of course, be wholly inadmissible; for the church has no such element in it, and could not, therefore, manifest it anywhere. When the missionaries or messengers of the churches should return from Cincinnati, the meeting is dissolved, and would be renewed only at the option of the churches. Before, therefore, there could take place any apostasy, the leaven of it must ripen in the churches. W.

W.'s ARTICLE.—The preceding may not be the very best article which has been written against the use of Missionary Societies; but certainly it is the best which has come under my eye. It is dignified and exceedingly thoughtful. It is on these grounds entitled to more than ordinary respect. This respect it is proposed to pay it in the next number of the *Quarterly*. It may therefore be well for the reader not to decide with W. till he hears still further.

THOU SHALT SURELY DIE.

THIS is the language of God, addressed to Adam, in the garden of Eden. Never had the word death fallen upon human ear before. There was the tree and its fruit. These he saw. He must not eat or touch either of them. This, Adam might easily understand. But what did God mean by the word die? I must think that Adam knew its meaning, else upon him it would have failed to exert the restraining influence intended, and that through no fault of his.

1. Separation is supposed by some to be the true idea. Does the Bible so define the word? It does not expressly. Does it by implication? I deny it. Adam and Eve were separated from the garden and also from the personal presence of God. In which separation consisted the death? In both? Then Adam died two deaths, or the one death which he died consisted of two specific separations.

But if either or both of these separations must be accepted as the exact equivalent of the word death, what is the meaning of the sentence: "Lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever?" Is not the life, in this quotation, in exact antithesis with the death contemplated as the penalty of the violated law? How, then, after the penalty had been inflicted, after the separations had taken place, could it be said: "lest he * * * live forever." Should any one attempt, in the *Quarterly*, to defend this hypothesis, his effort shall receive consideration.

2. Spiritual death was meant, say some. Indeed! What is spiritual death? Let the phrase, spiritual death, be well defined before any proofs are offered in support of this hypothesis. This having been done, we will ask, as before, are not the words life and death in direct antithesis? Of course they are, and were meant to be. If, now, the word death signifies spiritual death, the word life must signify spiritual life. It follows, then, that the Lord, after the separation of man from the garden, and from

his own personal presence, was careful lest the being whom he had already punished according to the letter and spirit of the law should live an endless spiritual life. Is not the very opposite of this true in fact? Did not God immediately make every provision possible for man's living spiritually forever?

Was not the death the penalty or sanction of the law? It certainly was. Can God inflict spiritual death upon his creatures? Impossible! Is not sin the only means of spiritual death? Can the end be reached without the means? The means God can not use, and, of course, he could not bring to pass the end. Some have supposed that spiritual death was the result of the transgression, and that God only warned man of it, but that he did not threaten him with it.

Is not this a mere childish view of the subject? True, man brought death upon himself, but just as the murderer brings himself to the gallows. The connection was established so between transgression and death that the transgressor must die. This God did as a terror against evil doing. Now does not that just complement our notion of a penalty? God did as certainly kill Adam, in the sense in which he said he should die, as he made him.

3. After man had sinned, God called him up, and reckoned with him, adjudicated his case. What are the facts in the case? God found him guilty, and proceeded to pronounce the sentence of condemnation upon him. The language of this sentence is significant: "Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." Must not this be held to be the best commentary upon and explanation of the sentence: "Thou shalt surely die?"

Moses wrote an account of the transgression two thousand five hundred years after the event. He wrote at a time when the word death was well understood to mean what we now mean by physical death. This was certainly its plain ordinary meaning. In this sense he would necessarily be understood by those for whom he wrote, when he used the word death to express his thought. If he used the term in any other than the usual sense, he was bound to give notice of the sense in which he did use it; for if he did not, he would necessarily be misunderstood. But

he gives no such notice. In a few sentences after Moses had written the language at the head of this, doubtless, at the same sitting, and within a few moments of the same time, he uses the same word without note or comment, in such a connection as to leave no doubt but that he meant simply and literally death, as we ordinarily use and understand the word. Adam lived nine hundred and thirty years, and he died. L.

THE FOREGOING.—L.'s piece is quite too brief for the subject of which he speaks. A score of pages would not be too many. The subject is important, peculiarly important. It hence deserves a thorough and lengthy handling. Whole bundles of popular and delusive divinity lie wrapped up in the theories respecting Adam's death. The very roots of these should be dug up and allowed to wither. Few men know to what extent these theories are shaping the preaching of the day. This should all be pointed out. But then, L.'s piece was designed to be merely suggestive, not exhaustive.

That the death first named by God to Adam was simple natural or ordinary death is to my mind simply certain. It was neither spiritual death, as distinguished from physical, nor physical as distinguished from spiritual. It was simply death, not a qualified death.

God said to Adam, "thou shalt not eat of it." This was the law. This law Adam violated. This violation was an act, and this act a sin. This sin affected Adam in two respects. 1. It unconditionally induced his death. This effect was chiefly physical. 2. But it also affected his spirit. If unforgiven before death, it lead to his being finally damned. This effect followed after death and was distinct from it. And herein lies the chief distinction between Adam's sin and our sins. For his sin he both died and, if the sin was not forgiven, was condemned. For our sins we do not die, but, if not forgiven, are simply condemned. For Adam's sin we die; for our own we are condemned. That other effects followed Adam's sin besides those here named is not denied. But these constituted no part of the meaning of the word death.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

I.

LET no one be surprised at the heading we have chosen for this short article on the finances of the kingdom of God. If Christ seized on the circumstances and scenes of the passing moment, to impress on the minds of his hearers the principles of the government he came to establish among men, surely his disciples can not err in following his example. To examine the financial systems of our own and other nations, deducing thence maxims to guide us to more efficient action in collecting and managing the revenues of the church, would, no doubt, be a pleasant and profitable employment. But this is not necessary to our present purpose, and until the church is so aroused to her duty as to greatly increase her income, it would be a superfluous work.

The principles on which the government of Christ and the governments of this world proceed in raising revenues are so different, the ends in view and methods of disbursing the money collected so diverse, that perhaps but little could be learned by comparing them applicable to the matter in hand. It needs no proof that Christ leaves it to each one's own conscience to say what he shall contribute to the support of the poor and the conversion of the world. Having imparted to all his disciples a new principle of life, and having placed them under new obligations of gratitude to God and of charity to their fellow-men, he commits the work of feeding the poor, sustaining his worship, and extending his kingdom to their voluntary contributions. On the other hand, earthly governments impose taxes and coerce their collection. On no other principle, perhaps, could they be carried on. They enforce the payment of taxes and the collection of revenue by pains and penalties, and without these the exchequer of no nation could be replenished. The very word ordinarily employed to designate the sums paid by the individual for the support of the government denotes that they are imposed, and in their col-

lection may be enforced. A tax is a sum of money assessed on the person or property of the citizen by government for the use of the State. The root of this word in the Greek language means to thrust on; to impose; to command. It is a burden; it may be just or unjust, light or heavy, still the essential idea is that it is a task to pay it. Indeed, tax and task are etymologically related.

In our own country this is emphatically a day of exorbitant taxation. If we were late in beginning to learn how much a government may collect of its subjects for its support, we bid fair to outstrip the Old World in the ease with which we master our lesson. The mind staggers at the figures that measure the enormous amount collected yearly in this country for the public use. Had a statesman foretold in the days of Adams or Jackson that within forty years of their administrations more revenue would be raised in a month than it cost them to carry on the government for a year, how insane he would have been considered; yet this is far short of the fact in the case. Until Cæsar says, I need it, and then takes it, we little dream how much we can spare of our property—it may be unwillingly—for the public use.

II.

In the kingdom of Christ there are no taxes. The word would sound harshly on our ears as belonging to his dialect. It may be right for Cæsar to collect his revenues by constraint; it is the glory of Christ that his are given with a ready mind. The principle of the one is coercive, of the other voluntary; the former increases his exaction from the dilatory and the delinquent, the latter will have from such nothing at all.

But is the citizen of Christ's kingdom free from obligation to contribute to his cause, seeing there is no coercion in the case; because what Christ will accept must come freely, or not at all? By no means. The reverse of this is true, as must be clear to any one who will reflect but a moment. It is evident that Christ's kingdom needs, and has ever needed, revenues, as much so as the kingdoms of this world. As these can not last for an hour without means to sustain them, neither can that. Even the Master himself, when here on earth, feeding thousands by miracle, and

sending gladness to the desolate homes of the poor and afflicted ; when his own household were few and their wants were easily supplied, yet had a treasurer who carried the purse of the little company, and disbursed what was needed to procure daily supplies. If, then, the company of the apostles, small in number, their wants few and simple, their travels confined to limits narrower than one of our medium-sized States, and in the company, too, of Him who could provide for them by a word, had, nevertheless, a treasury, what shall we say of the need now for means to supply the indigent of Christ's family with bread, and to carry on the enterprises of his church to the ends of the earth ?

Christ wrought great miracles of feeding while he was with us here, but he did not thereby intend to teach his disciples that he would dispense with their co-operation ; though he increased the bread faster than it could be eaten by the multitude, he yet required his apostles to bear it to the hungry and faint who had been waiting on his merciful ministry. He that said : " Lazarus, come forth," could have removed the stone from the grave, but *that* he required his followers to do. It is even so now ; the bread of life must be borne to the famishing of earth by his disciples. We must roll away the stones from the mouths of sepulchres where lie those dead in trespasses and sins, that the Lord of life and light may speak to the sleepers, and call them forth from corruption to the pure and rapturous fellowship of their kindred in Christ.

It is not the amount, but the inequality, of taxation that so often breeds complaint among the citizens of Cæsar's realm. If there be a necessity for imposing onerous pecuniary burdens on the people, all they demand is that there be equality in distributing them. It is one of the plainest dictates of justice that in such cases each one should bear his own burden, that he pay his proportion of the expense necessary to support the government. If the government be just and worth supporting, it will see that this be done, and when it is done, it is seldom the case that the collector is resisted.

III.

Political economists have advocated different systems for equalizing the burden of taxation. To examine these at length would be unsuited to the pages of the *Quarterly*; but if not, the discussion of them is unnecessary, because, as above stated, they all rest on the idea of compulsory collection, while in Christ's kingdom all is voluntary, nothing being acceptable to him that is not freely given. Still, the two cases are sufficiently alike to authorize us to insist on equality in distributing the burdens of a society among those who receive its benefits, whether the society be civil or religious. Government is the agent of society to carry out its purposes; it affords protection to all, and confers incalculable benefits on all; but to accomplish these good ends it must have revenues to meet the necessary expense incurred in working its extensive and complicated machinery; and does not justice say, let each one pay in proportion to the benefits he receives, the interests protected, and the cost of securing him in the possession of all his rights. It is a growing conviction with the best thinkers on these matters, that the best, because the most equitable, way of doing this is to levy the tax directly according to each one's wealth.

The cause of Christ is of infinitely more value than any government of this world, and if the church were doing its duty would require larger revenues to carry out its vast designs of conquest and extension. No Christian, specially should no rich Christian, be satisfied with giving only as much to the church as he pays to the civil power; and yet how few do half as much. When the church ceases to grow, it begins to die. It is here as everywhere else, growth is a condition of life. Christ intends that all nations shall come and find repose and shelter under this tree his own hand has planted; and to this end every one of his followers is required to labor and pray and contribute, to the full extent of his ability. That ability comes from him, and must be consecrated to him. It is a solemn trust committed to us for awhile, to prove whether or not we will be faithful, and thus be found worthy to rule over five or ten cities; or, being unfaithful, to be cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

We fear many Christians are debating with themselves whether or not they will become stewards of God's bounty to them. Now this is not a debatable point. If we be Christ's at all, we are, by our very profession, his stewards, and the only point for us to decide is whether or not we will be faithful stewards. Paul says : "It is required in stewards that a man be found faithful." Because this language found its immediate application in the case of apostles, we must not think that therefore it does not concern us. The thought that we are stewards of our absent Lord, and that he has committed to us a portion of his goods to be wisely employed till he return, often occurs in the New Testament, and is one of the most clear, most beautiful, and, I may add, one of the most solemn it contains. This relation results from the very nature of the divine constitution. Shall the creature who holds his life and all his comforts only by the Creator's sufferance, who brings nothing into the world and can carry nothing out of it, who can neither make nor destroy a single atom, shall such a one say to the sovereign Maker and Disposer of all, that any of the things he possesses is his own? Can he exercise the right of ownership over anything? To so think for a moment is superlative folly. Such is the relation we, as creatures, sustain to God; but when we add to this the vow we made when we gave ourselves and all we had to Christ and his service, it must be patent to the humblest understanding that there remains but one question for us to settle, and that is, whether or not we will be faithful in our stewardship.

IV.

As to the teaching of Scripture, the parable of the unjust steward, as it is called, will readily occur to the reader. All the instruction of the Savior and his apostles accords with the sentiment of this parable, and the practice of the early Christians confirms it. Our Lord would teach us by this parable the need of that careful forethought—that prudence in the use of his goods without which we shall never enter the everlasting mansions he has gone to prepare for those who have been faithful over few things that they may be lords over many. If a cunning man so provided that, on his employer's return and his consequent dis-

missal from office, he should be received into the houses of those he had made his friends, why should not we, who have been intrusted with the unrighteous mammon, so use it that it shall in the end be found to have advanced rather than hindered our salvation? The unrighteous mammon is elsewhere called deceitful riches; and by Paul, uncertain riches. They are unrighteous, not because obtained by unrighteous means, but because they will be found unrighteous and deceptive by all who trust in them. We can easily separate the dishonesty of the unjust steward from his prudence; we can not approve the former, we must commend the latter; and this is precisely what our Lord does. The best commentary we have found on this parable is in the conclusion of Paul's first letter to Timothy: "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life."

What a striking passage is this, and how it should be pondered by every one to whom God has intrusted an abundance of this world's goods! The simple teaching of our Master is, that we are all stewards; that we are to exercise prudence in the disposal of his goods; that we are to be faithful, honest, industrious, careful; and that we shall give an account at last for the way in which we have discharged our trust, and, finally, that our eternal destiny depends on our fidelity. In substance, Paul teaches the same solemn truths. With those who respect the word of God these two passages should be enough, but there is no lack of texts to confirm all this.

V.

Attachment to the treasure that moths and rust corrupt, and which thieves can steal from us, is wholly inconsistent with the Christian character. What we give, we save; this it is to lay up for ourselves treasure in heaven; and Christ has well said: "Where our treasure is, there will our heart be also." The spirit

of the gospel is one of beneficence. The Christian must do good and give alms. He must not only say : "Be ye warm and be ye clothed," but he must give the poor the things they need ; and, if he would follow the example of the Master, he must join with all his benefactions the wholesome advice : "Sin no more." There is no more favorable time to sow the word of God in human hearts than when they are broken up and mellowed by gratitude for aid extended in the hour of need. Our success in converting the world will be in the ratio of our liberality, and this is as it should be. Having been bought with a price ourselves, we must glorify God with our bodies and our spirits, which are his. "One thing thou lackest yet," said Jesus to one he loved, but whom he saw to be attached to his possessions, "go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and come and follow me."

We insist the more on this, because mistake is so common and so fatal. If we do not appreciate our duty here, we will hardly do it anywhere else. If we suppose our goods are our own, and that we can do with them as we please, we will make but sorry agents for our Lord ; we may become even thieves and robbers. Let us settle it in our minds that the only control we have of the wealth in our keeping is that of agency, and then our duty will be plain and simple. We will at once employ it so as to yield the largest revenue of praise to God. We will hardly squander it on our lusts, while our poorer brethren are lacking the necessaries of life.

I know a congregation not one hundred miles from where I am now writing this, one of the largest, and I may say, one of the best in the Reformation, some of whose members live in stone palaces, and are clothed in fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day, and yet in that very congregation, not more than a year ago, one of its most pious and fervent members died, wanting many of the common necessities of life. Now I dare not say those men in the stone palaces are not Christians. I can easily imagine if this fall under their eye, and they realize they are of those guilty of such neglect, their hearts and consciences would upbraid them. If this were a rare case, it might be attributed to accident, and to reason from it would be unfair ; but it is not an isolated case, it is

but one of a class, and a fair sample of what happens often in large city churches.

It is not necessary to appeal to such cases as the above to show that something is radically wrong in relation to the subject before us. The whole history of the modern church might be cited in evidence. It is conceded on all hands, that, in view of the number, intelligence, and wealth of our membership, our church revenues are small. Numbers, intelligence, and wealth are elements of power in a church only as they are joined to a due realization of obligation to God in respect to the support and extension of his kingdom on the earth ; otherwise they may become elements of weakness and of ultimate death. We are said to number five hundred thousand in the United States alone, and without vanity, it may be said, these are above the average in intelligence even of our American population ; as to pecuniary ability, we have as much of that as any equal number united in any society, political or religious, known to us ; and yet, what are we doing worthy of such a people ? I do not ask what we are doing through our missionary and other organizations, for that is a very small fraction of what we as a people are doing ; but I mean, what are we doing altogether ? Let this question come home with solemn earnestness to more than half of our congregations and their officers, and the main purpose of this paper will be accomplished.

Those for whose eye this is chiefly intended will readily grant that we have restored to the church the ordinances of the gospel ; and to the world, the gospel itself. We have laid down the only practicable basis of Christian union. We have placed the word of the Lord in its proper light before this generation ; in a word, we have restored the theory, and much of the practice, of Christianity to the church ; and this is no mean praise. It is rather a high claim to the gratitude of this century, and all that shall succeed it. All this I freely concede, and I esteem it the glory of my being that I have been connected with this movement ; but I can not forbear asking, how would the account have stood to-day had we brought the church of this age up to the requirements of the New Testament in respect of the fellowship and prayers, as we have done in respect of baptism and the breaking of bread ?

VI.

What do we more than others? Are we doing as much? Do any of us come up to the demands of the Master? I ask not these questions in a captious spirit, God knoweth. I enter into no invidious comparisons. All I desire is to stimulate investigation into the requirements of the gospel; and by so doing, to show that we are yet sadly behind in our conceptions of this duty, and still farther in our performance. Let the reader make this a matter of reflection; let him study the life of Christ, the practice of the primitive churches, and the history of the first three centuries, and he will not fail to see that, in respect of the consecration of our property to the glory of God and the relief of suffering humanity, we are shamefully below the point attained by the church in its infancy and poverty. Do we now wonder at the rapid spread of the gospel over Judæa, Samaria, and the ends of the earth? Behold the reason of this wonderful success in the entire devotedness of its first converts. "No one said that aught of the things he possessed was his own." Did not many sell even all they had, and bring the price and lay it at the apostles' feet, that distribution might be made to every man as each had need? We are amazed at the incredible zeal and charity of those days, and can account for it only by the reflection that those converts were made partakers of the spirit of Him who was rich, but became poor for our sakes, that we through his poverty might be made rich.

Has our King any claims upon us? He surely never intended his ministers to put on the garb and demeanor of mendicants, and set out on a pilgrimage of everlasting beggary, overjoyed if perchance some wealthy hypocrite should dole out a few coppers from his coffers of gold, or a few crumbs of comfort from his sumptuous table. The Savior does really, in the persons of his poor, famish for the bread that perishes; he cries aloud in the wails of the sinful, the sad, and the lost, for the bread that endures unto eternal life. And shall he who gave us blood, ask in vain for gold? Shall he who has made us all rich, turn away in unutterable grief from the palatial abode of one who professes to be his friend? Shall he enter his own chancel, and in full view of the pulpit, the

altar, and the cross, appeal unheeded, in agony and tears, to the cushioned pews, the diamonds, and the silks, imploring a pittance from the sisters of Mary, and Martha, and Lazarus, to help him on his way to homes made desolate and sad by death, that in the brightness of his coming broken hearts may be healed, and multitudes be added to the hosts of heaven and earth, filling the universe with his praise? Where e'er he comes,

“He makes a sunshine in a shady place.”

If there be one point clearer to my mind than another it is that, as a people, we are sadly derelict in our duty as to systematic beneficence. The whole ground must be reviewed; our scribes must write about it, our preachers must preach about it, and every disciple must be made to feel the responsibility under which the Lord of all has placed him to devote larger sums to his cause, and to do it with greater regularity. I esteem it one of the most auspicious omens of the times that the people of God are awaking to the consideration of this long-neglected theme.

Because the system of Christ differs from that of Moses in this, that it does not prescribe the precise amount nor the special occasions of our offerings, we must not suppose that we shall be guiltless if we neglect to bring at all. Shall we refuse to bring our richest gifts because we are not under the law but under grace? God forbid! “To do good, and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.” To sacrifice is of the essence of all true religion in every dispensation.

However the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian institutions may differ in other respects, in one point they will be found to agree—that in each, men were required to set apart a large portion of their substance for religious purposes, and that they were to do this frequently. Abel brought his offering to God, Noah sacrificed to his Preserver, and Abraham gave tithes to Melchisedek, priest of the Most High God. This same custom is recognized in Job, that oldest of all books. Jacob's vow at Bethel is recorded in Gen. xxviii., and it concludes with these memorable words: “And of all that thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tenth unto thee.” It was doubtless from this patriarchal

custom that pagan nations from remotest antiquity derived their idea of bringing to their gods most rare and costly offerings. Whether, then, we consult the true or the false, we shall find that to consecrate property to sacred purposes is as old as religion itself.

VII.

Turning to the institution of Moses, we shall find he associated the claim of God on the property of his people with the most common things of life. To whatever the Hebrew turned his eye, his fields, his flocks, his orchards, his harvests, his oil, and his wine, yea, his first-born son, he was reminded of God's demand. His Sabbaths of repose and his seasons of festive joy, his new moons and his days of atonement, all called upon him to sacrifice present gain to the favor of God. No foot-sore and weary stranger halted at his gate or drank at his well; no poor Hebrew brother, whose fortunes had fallen into decay, parted with his inheritance in the land promised to the fathers; no Levite officiated on his behalf in tabernacle or temple, that did not call to his remembrance that the God of Israel had redeemed him with a price, and that he and all he had was Jehovah's.

It is a matter of just surprise to every careful reader of the Pentateuch how much was required of the Hebrews in the service of God. We readily concede that what the law imposed was for both religious and political objects. This arose from the peculiar nature of the Mosaic economy. The Hebrews' religion and politics were inseparably blended—Jehovah was both their magistrate and their divinity, their king as well as their God; hence an impious action was rebellious as well. To join in the worship of another god was a capital crime, and subjected the culprit to a rebel's doom. It is only as we keep in mind this two-fold relation of God to Israel that we can account for what at first sight seems unnecessary severity in punishing offenses. Now, allowing that the Hebrew paid at once for the support of his religion and his government, it may well cause us surprise to remember that his tax for these amounted to largely over one-third of his income. There were the first-fruits of his flocks, his herds, and his fields; the redemption of his first-born son, the gleanings of his

harvests left for the poor, all that fell from the reapers' hands, and a tenth of all the products of the soil given to the Levites. Add to this his time spent in the service of religion,—every seventh day, seventh year, and the year of jubilee; the new moons, days of atonement, and days of special service. There were besides, trespass-offerings, sin-offerings, and burnt-offerings; gifts and hospitalities to the poor and the stranger; his journeys to Jerusalem to attend the three great annual feasts; his half-shekels for the sanctuary, and his gifts and forfeits innumerable. Count up all these, and not much short of one-half of all a pious Jew earned went to God. Is it asked how the nation prospered under all these exactions? Our answer is apparent in every line of their history. They prospered only as they bore these burdens, and paid faithfully to God his dues. Whenever they defrauded their King of his revenues, they were impoverished and enslaved. The bitterest complaints of their prophets are against Israel seeking to rob God; their highest commendation, when the people brought their gifts to his treasury. Malachi, the last of their prophets, furnishes one out of many illustrations. "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation. Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in my house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

If it be objected that the law and the prophets were until John, and since then the gospel is preached; that we are freed from the burdens of former dispensations, I might pertinently ask, if these things of a former age were not intended to teach us a lesson? Was it because God needed anything, or was dependent on his people, that he required it at their hands? "The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts." "If I were hungry, I would not tell thee; for the world is mine and the fullness thereof." If we turn from the law to the gospel to get clear of this obligation, we shall be sadly disappointed. If Moses demanded one-half, Christ requires all. The Christian must realize that all he has, and he himself, belong to the Lord.

VIII.

We might rest the case here, and leave each servant to settle the account with his Master ; but we will call attention to the demands of the gospel on all who receive it, as shown by a few well-known allusions in the New Testament. Passing by the example of the Messiah, and the apostles before the day of Pentecost, to which we have already referred, not to urge that the spirit of the gospel is more expansive and benevolent than the law, that the former aims at the conquest of the world, while the latter confined its operations to a single people, let us turn directly to the first church at Jerusalem. Is there a point in the history of that church, founded on Pentecost, blest with the ministry of all the apostles, and richly endowed with the gifts and graces of the Spirit,—is there a point, I say, on which Luke dwells with greater pleasure than the enlarged liberality of these early converts to our faith? He recurs to it again and again, as if he would never weary in holding it up for our imitation ; and oh ! what a fearful warning he gives us in the case of Ananias and Sapphira against lying to the Holy Spirit.

So conclusive is the example of the Jerusalem church, that not a few parsimonious Christians seek to parry its force by the conceit that there was established in that city a system of communism something like Fourierism, or Owenism, or Shakerism, than which nothing could be farther from the truth. To my mind, it has all the force of an intuition, that neither in Jerusalem nor among the Gentiles did the apostles establish any such system. It is antagonistic to the whole spirit of Christ's religion, and would, if put into practice, frustrate its benevolent design. There is something higher and holier in the lives and practice of these early Christians than the selfish system of communism.

Let us follow the record, and examine the allusions to the liberality of the Greek and Syrian churches to these same brethren in Jerusalem, in the day of their calamity. In Acts xi., 27–30, we are informed that the church at Antioch, A. D. 44, made an abundant collection for the poor saints in Judæa, and sent it by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. Fifteen years after this, another

famine desolated Judæa, and the churches of Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Achaia sent largely to the relief of their suffering brethren of the Jews. It is in this transaction the benevolent heart of Paul finds free scope for its generous sympathies. In his fervent exhortations to those of Achaia, his commendation of those of Macedonia and Asia Minor, and the lofty strain in which he speaks of this grace of beneficence, he shows that he had penetrated to the core of that religion which teaches "it is more blessed to give than to receive." In 2 Cor. viii., Paul condenses the whole doctrine of charity into the narrowest limits, and there is not found on all the pages of earth a fairer portraiture of this child of heaven than here presented. Pity it is that our common version conceals some of its best features.

Now, if to contribute to relieve the physical wants of men be one of the plainest duties of a Christian, and if alacrity in its performance calls forth warmest commendation and blessing from Christ and his holy apostles, it has all the force of an *a fortiori* argument with us to urge to larger liberality in sending to perishing millions the sovereign dittany that is to cure all the ills of the soul.

IX.

But another thought must not be omitted in this connection. It is not so much the benefit that accrues to the recipient, as the cultivation of benevolent affections in the giver, that is uppermost in the mind of both Christ and Paul. The nature of the case here confirms the teaching of Scripture. God could feed his poor and preach his word by the ministry of angels if he saw fit, but, then, would that develop in us those traits of character, that meetness for heaven and the presence of the Great Philanthropist, without which no one can enjoy his companionship? Truly, in this view of the case, charity is twice blest; "it blesses him that gives and him that takes," but far more the former than the latter. To redeem man from the dominion of selfishness is the end and aim of the gospel; a benevolent heart, animated by the love of Jesus to deny itself for the good of others, is the glory of human character; it is a flower, whose aroma exhales to heaven and delights the heart of God. Milton expresses a thought no

less just than poetical, when he represents Mammon setting his heart more on the golden pavement of the skies than on the throne and monarchy of Jehovah.

Thus far we have spoken of the duty of relieving distress, but this is not all; we should labor not less to prevent it. True Christian charity is preventive no less than subventive. It is certainly better to devote time and means to establish Sunday schools, to circulate the Scriptures, to build colleges, and in the thousand and one ways that modern society opens up, than to wait till the evil is done and then labor to relieve it. It is a wise saying, that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. What little was done in ancient times by governments or individuals (and it was but little) was to relieve distress; and the primitive Christians, from the necessities of their condition, were limited, in the main, to subventive charity. But God has, in his providence, opened up many ways in which the modern church may, by leavening society with its blessed spirit, do much to prevent poverty, and crime, and wretchedness. Nor is the Christian to wait till these are forced into his unwilling notice. He is to seek them out, and, enthused by the example of the world's Redeemer, he is to *seek* as well as to *save* the lost.

In no respect does modern, in comparison with ancient society, appear to greater advantage than in its methods of dealing with crime, ignorance, and poverty. It was a grand thing in Augustus to distribute corn every month to two hundred thousand destitute citizens of Rome, but it is grander still for Christian philanthropy to prevent such multitudes from becoming paupers. The genius of Christianity respects in the poor she relieves the image of God, and while relieving their want spares their modesty. She seeks out the virtuous and timid poor, and infuses into even the pariahs of society high and holy resolves. She not only saves, she purifies,—or more properly, she purifies and thus saves; and this by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit.

In conclusion, will the reader calmly review the whole subject; shut out from his thoughts for a single hour the world, his anxieties, ambitions, rivalries, and pleasures, and in solemn,

prayerful thought, ask himself how stands the account between him and his Lord. Specially, will not my rich brother pause, and in the light of the scriptures cited ask himself if he is prepared to give an account of his stewardship with joy and not with grief.

In handling our theme we have not emulated the usual keen and relentless logic of the *Quarterly*, assured that we need persuasion more than conviction. We have made our appeal more to the heart than to the intellect, believing that the example of Christ and the exhortations of the apostles should arouse us to our duty.

We have discussed no plans for carrying out the resolves we may have formed, for two reasons: first, we do not think any definite plan applicable in all cases is laid down in the Christian Scriptures; and, secondly, the plan that would be most convenient to one might not be so to another. We make little account of mere plans in matters of beneficence. We depend on that large spirit of benevolence imparted to every one who does intelligently and truly embrace the gospel of the blessed God.

There are, however, three points in Paul's direction to the Corinthian church (1st Epistle, xvi., 2), which well deserve attention by all who would faithfully do their duty in respect to this solemn subject: 1. Let every disciple contribute. 2. Let him do this as God has prospered him. 3. Let him do it systematically.

If we do this in the fear of God, a new era will dawn on the church, and a new life in our own souls. X.

"TAKE heed you measure not your love to truth by your opposition unto error. If hatred of error and superstition spring from sincere love of truth and true religion, the root is good and the branch is good. But if your love to truth and true religion spring from hatred to others' error and superstition, the root is naught and the branch is naught; then can no other fruit be expected, but hypocrisy, hardness of heart, and uncharitable censuring of others."—JACKSON.

ROMANISM, PROTESTANTISM, AND RATIONALISM.

I.

"VOLTAIRE and Rousseau did but seize up and re-echo through the world the self-same shout of liberty which Luther and Calvin had sent forth two and a half centuries before in Germany and Switzerland. The infidels did but carry out the leading doctrine of the Reformers, and all the world saw and felt the awful results of that principle, when it was fully developed.

"And not only the French infidels, but the children of the Reformers themselves, have carried out that mischievous doctrine to its logical and most fearful consequences. What is it that has blighted German, and Swiss, and European Protestantism generally? What is it that has filled the land of Luther and of Calvin, which erewhile resounded with the battle-cry of freedom from the tyranny of the papacy, with the discordant notes of triumph now raised by the Rationalists, Pantheists, and Transcendentalists? What is it that has there made the press, and the pulpit, and the professor's chair the vehicles of downright infidelity? What is it but this same demoniacal shout of liberty—liberty as excluding, and in deadly opposition to, all restraint of authority? Private reason first undertook to judge for itself in matters of religion, and it has ended in rejecting religion altogether. Infidelity has triumphed over Protestantism on the very soil and very first battle-ground of Protestantism; and it has achieved its triumph, too, with the very weapons which Protestantism placed in its hands. * * *

"The fatal source of all this mischief is the principle of private judgment in matters of religion, in opposition to that of authority. The distracting and disorganizing principle of individuality has set itself up against the great conservative principle of authority, based on antiquity, and secured from error by divine promise. Hence the prolific brood of jarring sects that overspread our land; hence the unsettling of religious belief; hence indifferent-

The Bishop of Louisville, it will be seen, confounds the fundamental principle of Protestantism with that of Rationalism and Infidelity, and would compel us, in consistency, either to adopt the Romish system of spiritual despotism, or become out and out infidels. Taking the case as presented, and supposing the human spirit to be driven to the choice of the one or the other of these alternatives, is it to be wondered at that many, with no higher conceptions of Christianity than Romanism furnishes, have rejected the former with the latter? Allowing, then, the validity of the Bishop's reasoning, it is not apt, we think, to diminish the amount of infidelity in the land. The truth is, that the prime cause of infidelity, in very many instances, is traceable to a failure to distinguish between Romanism and Christianity. This had much more to do with the infidelity of Voltaire and Rousseau than any supposed connection between their unbelief and the Protestant principle. And the assertion that these infidels "did but carry out the leading doctrine of the Reformers," is simply devoid of all truth. True, indeed, the French infidels contended for the freedom of thought, speech, and action; but their freedom was libertinism rather than liberty; whereas, the freedom advocated by the Protestant Reformers was that which divine truth confers upon the soul, as described by the Savior, in an address to the Jews: "If the truth shall make you free, you shall be free indeed." This liberty which the truth bestows will be defined anon.

The Bishop further observes that, "not only the French infidels, but the children of the Reformers themselves (the Rationalists, the Pantheists, and the Transcendentalists), have carried out their principle to its logical consequences. This principle, which he thus regards as the *fons et principium* of all modern infidelity, he defines to be "the principle of private judgment in matters of religion, in opposition to that of authority." This statement, divested of ambiguity by the insertion of the term *human* before "authority," we accept as a correct definition of the fundamental principle of Protestantism, denying at the same time that the developments of Rationalism, Pantheism, and Transcendentalism, are the logical consequences of its application.

II.

Let us then, first of all, distinguish between the great Protestant principle and that of Romanism on the one hand, and of Rationalism on the other, after which proceed to examine the merits of each. The Roman principle, according to the Bishop's statement, is the principle of authority in religious matters, in opposition to the right of private judgment, or otherwise called "the principle of individuality." But this is not sufficiently accurate. It is not authority merely for which Rome contends; but such authority as the Protestant discards as altogether fallible. The Romanist and the Protestant are not distinguished by the former accepting and the latter rejecting authority in the abstract; but by the different answers which they respectively return to the question: Who and what should be regarded as authoritative in religious matters? The Protestant admits authority, but will accept nothing less than a divine standard; while Rome, with her human head, puts forth a claim to authority alleged to be "based on antiquity, and secured from error by divine promise." This the Protestant rejects as sheer assumption. The difference lies here,—the Protestant places himself directly upon the Bible, and the Bible alone, and denies the right of any to stand between him and its divine utterances; while Rome denies the authority of this divine standard, except as measured by her own. She teaches, in other words, that the Bible is authoritative, but only as interpreted by her. The Rationalist, on the other hand, acts upon a principle differing both from the Roman principle and that of the Protestant, in that he rejects all objective authority whatever, both human and divine. He not only claims, in common with the Protestant, the privilege of interpreting the Bible for himself, but takes likewise the liberty of setting aside whatever does not commend itself to his own understanding. This, as the Bishop correctly observes, is a "liberty excluding, and in deadly opposition to, *all* restraint of authority." The italics are his, and his only error here lies in confounding this liberty with that which the Protestant claims. The former does not logically flow from the latter, as he boldly asserts; but as radically differs as error from truth. Surely the freedom conferred by

the truth, can not be identical with that which attempts its subversion. The liberty to understand and enjoy the truth is a very different thing from the liberty to deny and reject it. Thus the fundamental principle of Protestantism differs as widely from the principle of Rationalism as it does from the doctrine of Rome.

“Now the Protestant principle, which is thus distinguished from that of the Romanist and of the Rationalist, is of vital moment. Give up the principle of the normative authority of the Bible, and we are driven upon the alternative of either abjectly surrendering ourselves to the church, or of being set adrift, with the Rationalist, upon a sea of conjectures and uncertified reasonings of men.” Superstition, or infidelity—the one or the other—is inevitable the moment the great principle enounced by the Protestant Reformers is surrendered. Rome says, in effect: Be ye my willing slaves and dupes, and I will be your understanding and your conscience. Does the economy of God require the sacrifice? Must man ignore himself, by the surrender of those godlike attributes which distinguish him as man, and reflect in him the image of his Maker? Were some men made to think and act for others in the great concerns involving the interests of the immortal soul? Rome will reply that the holy twelve were, in the beginning, undoubtedly constituted “keepers of the faith,” and whatsoever they bound or loosed on earth was likewise bound or loosed in heaven. True, “God hath set some in the church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers,” etc., and there they remain to this day. Who dares presumptuously thrust himself into the place which they have never vacated? To them was committed, indeed, “the ministry of reconciliation,” and the world is now through them, “in Christ’s stead,” entreated of God to become reconciled to himself. Moreover, the edification of the saints themselves, and their perfection in the divine life, were intended to be fully secured through the agency of these spiritual organs. “He gave some (to be) apostles, and some (to be) prophets, and some (to be) evangelists, and some (to be) pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of

the stature of the fullness of Christ." Need we, then, more than these "gifts" of the Savior that we may be "complete in him?" Does any one feel his spiritual feebleness and his need of greater perfection in the divine life? Let him go for instruction and guidance to the apostles and prophets of the new economy, who will fill their exalted places in the church universal till the end of time. But who shall interpret for him the words of the apostles? We ask, in our turn, why should interpreters be needed now any more than when these apostles were in the flesh? Did Paul or Peter ever take along an interpreter to explain what he preached? The truth is, the apostles no more need interpreters than they need successors, and he who claims to be the one or the other is a humbug. The word of God is addressed directly to the intelligence and conscience of every responsible being, and is equally intelligible to all patient and earnest inquirers after truth. And why should it not be so? Are we not all equally interested in the "great salvation"? But to say that God's message of life and salvation is obscure, and needs explanation, is to impeach his benevolence and wisdom. Can not God speak with as much plainness as man? If his word demands authoritative interpretation, why may not the interpretation stand in need of interpreters, and these of still others, thus *ad infinitum*? As no one will advocate the absurdity of this infinite series, every one who seeks an authoritative expositor of the Bible thereby plainly declares his belief that man can speak more intelligibly than God! "But what saith the Scriptures?" "Unto me," says Paul, "who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Thus God, through the ministry of the apostles, addresses directly the understanding and the conscience of every man, and every man is directly and individually answerable to God alone. By what right, then, human or divine, shall any erring mortal undertake to mediate between my conscience and my God? In the brotherhood of Jesus no special class of persons, to the exclusion of all others, are clothed with priestly authority and power;

but all, as Christians, are constituted "kings and priests unto God." As such they are "a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." As such, too, they have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he has consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh ; and having a High-Priest over the house of God," we are exhorted by the apostle to "draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." This is the joyful privilege of every child of God, who, once "afar off," is now made nigh by the blood of Christ ;" and this service of the heart and conscience of the Christian priest is offered acceptably without any other mediation than that of Jesus, the "High-Priest over the house of God ;" for there is one God and one Mediator between God and men—the man Christ Jesus." Here, then, is scriptural recognition of "individuality"—the divine assertion of the sacred rights of the individual conscience. This is the glorious "liberty of the gospel, wherewith Christ has made us free;" and how utterly antagonistic therewith is the doctrine of Rome that the child of God can only approach his heavenly Father through the confessional, and can only approach his divine message to the heart and the understanding through human authoritative standards!

III.

From the statements and quotations before us we perceive clearly the harmony between the fundamental principle of Protestantism and the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. Let it be carefully noted that we speak of the principle of Protestantism, and not the practice of Protestants ; for Protestants have not been consistent. Instead of adhering rigidly to their own principle, they act, for the most part, upon that of the Romanist. They advocate individual liberty and proclaim the rights of conscience, and yet each party has set up a standard of orthodoxy, according to which the Holy Scriptures are to be interpreted and applied. The use of human creeds as authoritative standards is utterly at variance with the great principle upon which the Protestant Reformers planted

themselves, and hence none are true and consistent Protestants but those who reject all creeds and formulas save "the faith once delivered to the saints." It has been said, however, that every man has a creed, either written or unwritten, and that those who profess to repudiate all authoritative standards but the Bible really erect into such a standard their own unwritten interpretation of the Scriptures, to which all must conform in order to obtain their religious fellowship. It is easy to explode this sophistical statement, and yet by it many have deceived both themselves and their neighbors. The statement is, in fact, inconsistent and absurd; for if the interpretation of any document, rather than the document itself, is the creed of him who receives it as a rule of faith and practice, it follows that there never was and never can be a written creed, and hence it can not be said that every man has a creed, either written or unwritten, but the creed of every man must of necessity be unwritten, if what is implied in the statement be correct. Accordingly, the ecclesiastical documents called "confessions of faith" are not the creeds of those who receive them as such, but their unwritten interpretation of those documents must, upon the principle before us, be regarded as their creeds. On the other hand, if any man can have a written creed, then "the Bible, and the Bible alone," is the creed all divine and infallible with those who receive it as such. The Bible thus stands related to their faith as the various human standards stand related to the faith of those who receive them. If it be alleged that these standards contain what the Bible contains, more clearly expressed, the declaration is an insult to the Author of the Bible, by the attribution of greater wisdom and benevolence to man. If it be said that their teaching is that of the Bible without greater clearness, they become a useless impertinence. But if they teach and authorize what the Bible does not, they are not only useless, but are dangerous and sinful.

IV.

We pass on to the consideration of the rationalistic principle upon which the Bible itself, as an authoritative standard of truth and morality, is made to take its place with human symbols of

faith. "When I open an epistle of Paul and find there a passage upon the design and effect of the Savior's death, and when I have ascertained the sense of the passage by a fair exegesis, may I then be sure of its truth? Or when I meet on the page of Scripture with practical injunctions pertaining to the duties of life, may I depend upon them as strictly conformed to the truth, and shape my conduct in accordance with them?" To this vitally important question both the Romanist and the Rationalist return a negative answer, and it will be seen that the two are much nearer kin than has been commonly supposed. According to the former, the sense of Scripture, though "ascertained by a fair exegesis," is not to be accepted or relied upon until it is confirmed by human authority, supposed to be enlightened by direct spiritual illumination; while, according to the latter, it is not to be received unless it coincides with supposed intuitions of the human intellect. With both, it will be seen at once that the mere authority of the Bible is not ultimate and final, but subordinate and secondary, when truth and duty are the subjects of investigation. Each turns away from the Bible to a human standard, and each is, of course, as rebellious as the other in thus substituting human for divine authority.

"The spirit of Rationalism," says Lecky, "leads men on all occasions to subordinate dogmatic theology to the dictates of reason and of conscience, and, as a necessary consequence, greatly to restrict its influence upon life. It predisposes men, in history, to attribute all kinds of phenomena to natural rather than miraculous causes; in theology, to esteem succeeding systems the expressions of the wants and aspirations of that religious sentiment which is planted in all men; and in ethics, to regard as duties only those which conscience reveals to be such." That we can not, at the imperious demand of the Romanist, surrender the individual reason and conscience without self-abasement, every reasonable person will concede. That we are, therefore, entitled, at the call of the Rationalist, to elevate "the dictates of reason and conscience" to supreme jurisdiction in history, theology, and ethics, no really rational mind can believe. We certainly may not throw away our understanding or our conscience; yet it were folly to deify either. Let us descend to particulars: 1. The spirit of Rational-

ism, says Lecky, "predisposes men, in history, to attribute all kinds of phenomena to natural rather than miraculous causes." Thus when a miracle is found recorded among the historical phenomena of the Bible, it must be expunged in accommodation to the spirit of Rationalism. It is in this particular, more than in any other, that Rationalism exhibits its hostility to the Bible. Whatever concessions the Rationalist may make, he will not admit the occurrence of a miracle under any circumstances. In fact, he feels sure that such an event never did occur in the history of the universe, and he goes as far, at times, as to deny its possibility. Now, why this opposition—this irrational opposition—to the supernatural? Neither reason, philosophy, nor science will justify this procedure. The Rationalist may prate as long and as loud as he will about "the uniformity of the course of nature," but the really learned, the really scientific, recognizing equally the uniformity of natural laws, have heretofore been, and will hereafter continue to be, unfaltering believers in the reality of the supernatural. That nature is uniform in her operations is no proof that a Power higher than nature can not also operate whenever and wherever he pleases, either through natural laws, or independently of them, or in opposition to them. Atheism is the only ground on which the supernatural can be logically denied, and atheism is absurd. The question of miracles is thus carried up into the higher questions touching the existence and freedom of God in the universe which he willed into being. Is he subject to the absolute sway of those laws which he himself impressed upon the material framework of his hand; or can he modify, suspend, abolish them at his pleasure? This is the real issue underlying the controversy touching the supernatural, and those who deny the reality of miracles must be prepared to take the logical step beyond.

Now as the recognition of a free, intelligent Being as the ruler of the universe removes all antecedent improbability of the miraculous when circumstances would justify his interposition in the affairs of this world, instead of rejecting as improbable or impossible such interference, we should naturally and reasonably expect its occurrence as occasion demanded. Accordingly, in a book which purports to be a revelation of this august Being, we

should not only look for the appearance of the miraculous, but would feel the incongruity of its absence. The existence of God acknowledged, a revelation of his character and will becomes desirable and necessary, and this necessitates the performance of miracles. How it could otherwise be authenticated, we are at a loss to know. Indeed, the very conception of a revelation involves the conception of the miraculous. The three conceptions—miracles, revelation, God—are inseparable, and the Rationalist must end in becoming an Atheist. Will it be said that we here proceed upon the principle of the Rationalist so far as to vindicate before the tribunal of reason the miraculous element of the Bible? Certainly. The devout, intelligent believer has never supposed for a moment that the contents of revelation are inconsistent with sound reason or true philosophy; yet, realizing that many of its sublime doctrines transcend the loftiest range of human thought, he refuses to make his own feeble intellect the measure of their truth or reality.

V.

We pass from history to ethics; theology, the second item, being omitted, as its discussion is necessarily involved in the consideration of the other two. "In ethics," says Lecky, "Rationalism predisposes men to regard as duties only those which conscience reveals to be such." If the merits of this author as a historian be estimated by his knowledge of metaphysics, his *History of Rationalism in Europe* could never become a standard work on the subject treated therein. We have here a new discovery in psychological science—the discovery that conscience "reveals" moral truth! Nor is this all; we must accept "as duties only those which conscience reveals to be such." Of course, then, all other revelations, so far at least as duty is concerned, are hereby superseded. Had the author taken one more step, he would have become as enlightened as F. W. Newman, who avers that "an authoritative external revelation of moral and spiritual truth is essentially impossible to man." Now these aberrations of the rationalistic spirit are clearly the outgrowth of a radical misconception touching the philosophy of our mental constitution. That man possesses a fac-

ulty of intuition, moral as well as intellectual, the profoundest thinkers not only allow, but have given the clearest and most irrefragable demonstration of the fact. Yet nothing is generally so imperfectly comprehended as the fundamental principles of the intuitional philosophy. Truth must, in all cases, be presented to the mind before any faculty that man possesses can be aroused to activity. As light, together with the objects it reveals, is to the eye, so is revelation, with its lofty presentations, to the reason and conscience of man. And as the eye without light would be shrouded in darkness eternal, so would the soul eternally grope in a night without end if deprived of the guidance of God's holy word. "The conscience," says Dr. McCosh, "points to an authority above itself. It is supreme as within the mind, but it is not absolutely supreme. It claims to be superior to all other motives, such as the love of pleasure, and even to the desire of intellectual improvement; indeed, it seems to point to an authority above the mind altogether. At the same time it does not seem to announce the nature of the object which it would prompt us to seek after. In this respect it is like some of our intellectual intuitions, which impel us to look round for something which they do not themselves reveal. Thus intuitive causality constrains us when we discover an effect, to look for a cause, but it does not specify what the cause is. In like manner our moral faculty seems to point to some power, principle, or being, it says not what, above itself. It does not claim for itself that it is infallible, that it is sufficient, that it is independent. It bows to something which has authority; it acknowledges a standard which is and must be right; it looks up for sanction and guidance. It says that it ought to yield to no earthly power; but it does not affirm of itself that it can never mistake, and that there is no authority to which it should submit. On the contrary, it often finds itself in difficulty and perplexity, and feels that it should look round and up for a light, and it is sure that there is such a light. What is thus unknown to the intuition itself, but which, notwithstanding it is ever seeking, is revealed by other processes."

VI.

These are the clear utterances of the latest and most elaborate as well as the most lucid expounder and defender of the philosophy of intuition. Reason, the faculty of intellectual intuition, and conscience, the faculty of moral intuition, "impel us to look round for something which they do not themselves reveal." They are thus dependent for their information upon "external revelation." Says Cousin, the profoundest thinker of this school: "Strictly speaking, there are no propositions in nature, neither concrete propositions nor abstract propositions, neither particular propositions nor general propositions; for a still stronger reason, there are no ideas in nature." And again: "There are no innate ideas, there are no innate propositions, because there are neither ideas nor propositions really existing." Intuitive convictions are not innate, in the sense of being written, as it were, upon the human soul by the hand of Nature, or of Nature's God; but are said to be intuitive, because they arise spontaneously and irresistibly, with the characteristics of necessity and universality, upon the presentation of truth to the mind. To instance an intellectual intuition: the senses reveal the presence of a change in the external world, and reason immediately proclaims the existence of a cause, the mind being influenced by the silent operation of a fundamental law of its own, by which it is constrained to ascribe every effect to some cause. In like manner, when God propounds his moral laws to the human conscience, it immediately affirms that these laws are based upon principles that are eternal, and recognizing at once "the immutability of moral distinctions," it asserts without hesitation that there is "an eternal and immutable morality." This is the limit of moral intuition.

When the reason and the conscience, with all of their powers of intuition, are thus seen to be dependent upon an objective "standard which is and must be right," and to which they "look up for sanction and guidance," their frequent aberrations through lack of information, or when imperfectly informed, should not excite wonder. "Those who have gone through the demonstrations of Euclid are constrained to believe the truth of every proposition; but the truths have never so much as been presented to the minds

of the great majority of mankind, and many persons might easily be persuaded that the angles of certain triangles are equal to less or to more than two right angles." And so likewise may wrong decisions of the conscience be given, notwithstanding the intuitive character of our moral convictions. "In whatever way we may reconcile them," says Dr. McCosh, "these two facts can each be established on abundant evidence: the one, that in the primitive exercises of conscience there is a conviction of necessity; the other, that the conscience is liable to manifold perversions." By experience and observation both we know of a certainty that moral as well as intellectual obligations abundantly exist; and this liability to error on the part of reason and conscience evinces the necessity of an objective, infallible standard of truth and morality. Let the Rationalist abandon his "uncertified reasonings and conjectures," where the shadows of doubt and perplexity eternally fall upon the restless and trembling spirit, and come to the soul-satisfying fountain of all wisdom and virtue, "and the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep his mind and heart through Jesus Christ." Let the Romanist exchange his human authorities, fallible and weak as they are, for the one divine, unerring, and alone authoritative standard of truth. Let the Protestant consistently maintain his great axiom, that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. And let all exclaim, in the sublime strains of Paul: "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God. How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out? For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor? or who hath first given to him and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen." G.

HOME.—If this be our best prototype of heaven, how imperative is the duty of parents to make it so pleasant and happy for their children, as that its delights shall ever cause each child to long to be fitted for the enjoyment of the unending communion, the ecstatic singing, the unspeakable glories, of their home of homes beyond

A JOURNEY FROM CAIRO TO JERUSALEM.

A SKETCH.

I.

FOR the last time we looked upon the Pyramids, the silent and sleepless sentinels of the ages. We had explored Cheops, and stood upon its bald and lofty summit. * * * Now, we turned sadly away, and sighed as we thought of man and his mutability. A weary waste of sand lay before us. The simoom touched our cheeks, and a spirit of desolation was, for an instant, regnant in our bosoms. But we looked toward Jerusalem, and hopefully journeyed onward. For many days we wandered amid desolate scenes. On the evening of the twenty-fourth of our departure from Cairo we reached Nukb es-Sufâh, the Pass of the Rock, through a difficult gorge; rock piled upon rock in irremediable confusion. It seemed like a remnant of chaos without the baptism of night. * * * Our tents were pitched. The moon arose, clear and full, and invited a ramble down the valley. The stillness and solitude of that hour were impressive. Not a foreign sound save the whirl of the busy beetle. It was to be our last night in the Desert, for we were just beneath the brow of Palestine. In the morn that brow was radiant with light, and we thought with life. It was to our weary hearts a kindly greeting; and yet, the thought of leaving the Desert, upon whose welcome, though barren bosom we had so oft reposed, was sad. We had found intimate companionship in its burning sands and dreary hills. Its sons were savage, but we had not found them false. * * * The Israel of God had wandered there, in that wilderness, and it was full of memories which came clustering and thronging to our hearts to nestle there, and bid us understand the great lesson of life. Moses and Aaron were before us. Joshua and Caleb stood beside us. The Land of Promise was just above us. Kadesh-barnea was reputed near, and Hebron was ahead.

There was a strange charm in the Desert. I feel it even now, though years have since rolled by, and the mighty waters flow between us. It was in the full spring-tide, and the mirage was in

all its unsubstantial glory. We beheld gushing fountains and flowing streams; lakes and islands appeared to rise by enchantment. The fairest visions dawned upon our horizon. It was a dream of life. They fled as we approached. It was a lesson of life. But there was a stranger spell. * * * There is no solitude on the face of the earth like the depths of the Desert—perfect silence, perfect stillness, perfect death. Oft I stood alone, and looked upon the dreary scene. Not a sign of life, animal or vegetable, was visible. Not a sound was heard. Not an atom stirred. And yet—deem me not superstitious, Christian reader—the very air seemed peopled with intelligences. I thought I could feel their presence and their power. They discoursed to my soul. Was I on the confines of the land of spirits, or was it the reflex of my own spirit that breathed this spell? It was no longer a solitude; the air was full of life. I could hear the chiming of the desert-bells. Tender tones of memory vibrated at the touch of thought, and the tender ringing voice of love came up from the deathless past. The spirit held undisturbed empire, and I seemed to realize a translation to a higher, holier, happier sphere. Call this what you may. I shall not philosophize.

II.

The night had stolen silently away. The Land of Promise, with its huge, rocky bastions, towered majestically above us. We would soon stand upon that lofty upland. Our pilgrim feet would soon press that sacred soil. Faithful old Abou Selim, our sheikh, was at his post. The tents were struck, the camels were packed, and the march began. Along the rugged defile, the caravan slowly wended its way. It had, long before, made its exodus from Egypt. How faithful had the sons and “the ships of the desert” been; and now the exode from the Desert was near. A few days more and their land-voyage would end.

Nature was in a determined mood when Palestine was wrenched from the Desert. Along the defile were numerous proofs that there had been a mighty struggle there. We soon met a bold, rocky barrier and natural amphitheatre, which forced us to turn directly to the right, and thence directly to the foot of the Pass,

which confronted huge ramparts. We began the difficult ascent, and found the road very steep and tortuous. It was hard work for the camels along the naked rock. Very soon we faced the grand theatre again which we peopled with ten times ten thousand spectators. We sounded our jubilee. The rocks caught the contagion, and responded in grand reverberations. But oft we paused, in silence and in thought, in our march up to the Promised Land. * * * There had been a period, full three thousand three hundred years before, when no peaceful, joyous cry disturbed those sleeping rocks. Israel was sorely smitten and discomfited, and her dismal cry penetrated that heart of stone, which gave back answering cry. It was here, at Es-Súfah (Zephath-Hormah), that repentant but rebellious Israel was driven back in the sinful and presumptuous attempt to possess the land after the Lord had pronounced against it.

III.

At length we gained "the hill-top," and stood full one thousand six hundred feet above the sea of waters, and one thousand feet above the sea of sand. We breathed a purer atmosphere; for had we not come up from the wilderness of Zin? But we saw that our way was flinty and desert still. Half a mile beyond we observed a half-fertile spot, and soon entered upon a plain adorned with tufts of grass and stunted shrubs. A low range of barren hills was then passed, and we crossed another plain similar in character and extent to the first. Here, said our Arabs, Abou (father) Abram pitched his tent. It was a pleasing thought that the first name pronounced in the Land of Promise was that of its prime representative, the "Father of the Faithful," and the "Friend of God." But that name had been uttered by the sons of Ishmael, not by the sons of Isaac! Busy memories were at work as we traversed the plain, and ascended the low ridge beyond. And now a vision of life and beauty dawned upon our horizon, which had been bound so long by the desert waste. How welcome the sight! Instead of sand, the plain was covered with rich and living grass; instead of flint and rock, fragrant flowers welcomed us. Was it a relic of the ancient land that "flowed

with milk and honey?" Encircled by desert-hills, it was like an offspring of Paradise in the arms of the earthly wilderness. But our attention was soon arrested by extensive ruins along the eastern edge of this luxuriant spot—death in the midst of life. We promptly repaired to the site of the ruined city. For more than half a mile the rocky remnants extended. Our dragomans and Arabs could not determine them, but they were, no doubt, those of Kurnub; probably the Tamar of Scripture and the Thamarara of Ptolemy. They were too far from the Pass to identify them with Zephath-Hormalh. There was not an inscription to give even a clue to the name or character of the lost city; but its fate was solemnly expressed in the remains before us. We observed the bare remnant of a house in the form of a shelter, which on entering was, at once, discovered to be a haunt of wild animals. Hard by was a cave-like chamber, or vault. It, too, was a lair. What sad thoughts possess the mind amid such scenes! Nature smiled in triumph over the mighty works of art. The proud palaces and the strong city had become the home of wild beasts. And this was the Holy Land! Then, indeed, did we feel forcibly, "The palaces shall be forsaken; the multitude of the city shall be left; the forts and towers shall be for dens forever." "Yet the defended city shall be desolate, and the habitation forsaken, and left like a wilderness." O Palestine, thou favored and false! Thou blessed and cursed! How surely hath the Avenger visited thee! How His finger hath scathed thee! And yet how truly doth He hold and keep thee still!

Thence, our route lay through a deserted and desolate region. On the evening of the following day, we stood upon a lofty summit of the "mountains of Judah," from which we had an extended view. To the south, lay the Desert, like a sea. In the far distance loomed the hills near Nekhel. On the east we beheld the "wilderness of Judæa," even unto the Dead Sea. This region had been represented as entirely desolate; indeed "beyond what the imagination of man could conceive." Yet, from our standing-point, we could only distinguish the expression of general desolation, barren hills, and shadowy valleys. Still, there was something attractive in the soft blending of the lights and

shadows which seemed to represent the ancient glory, while expressing the present ruin of the land. The views to the north and west were not so grand, although not less inviting. The sons of Anak dwelt here, while yonder was the border of the Philistines. The Past was reproduced. The trials and triumphs of Israel, their goodly heritage, "the glory of all lands," the scenes of the most stupendous displays of divine wisdom, power, and love. All this glory had now departed; and the land and people of Israel are but melancholy monuments of their pristine power, beauty, and grandeur. The great father and founder of their race maintained his integrity by obedience. He won the supreme confidence of the Most High through obedience. And the sublime declaration and promise of the Lord were consequent on his obedience. And why this present unhappy condition of the Land of Promise? Why had its people been scattered unto the uttermost ends of earth? Why is the remnant in the land like strangers where their fathers dwelt? All, all is sadly summed up in one word—Disobedience! (Deut. xxviii., etc.) And shall we not profit by the lesson of Israel?

IV.

We descended the "mountain" unto es-Semu'a, the Eshtemoa of the Book, where we encamped for the night. We had observed ruins a short distance from the village, but could not identify them; sad monument of a past age.

On the following morn we eagerly began our march, for Hebron was near, and invited us on. Much of the way led through narrow valleys, and over rocky ridges clothed with shrubs. Remains of terraces lay on either side. They told a story of the days of old, when "Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig-tree." Other ruins rose before us, and spoke not less eloquently of the past. But soon, like a hope of the future, the olive, the vine, the fig, with fields of grain appeared. Flocks of sheep and goats, with camels, enlivened the scene. We were on the borders of Eshcol; and now, Hebron was at our feet. Here dwelt Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Here they walked with God, and here they were buried in the cave of

Machpelah, around which the city stood. Here the "sweet Psalmist of Israel" dwelt as king over Judah, and here he was anointed king over Israel.

This noble inheritance of Caleb was built before Zoar, in Egypt, and its name occurs in Scripture earlier than that of Damascus. But Hebron bears no traces of its ancient glory. War, and pestilence, and famine have done their work. The curse of God is upon the land and upon its ancient people, very few of whom dwell in the city of Caleb. The descendants of Ishmael, not of Isaac, are sovereign there. * * * I repaired to the Mosque which covers the cave, and standing before the grand portal, several Musselmans gazed upon me, not impatiently, or intrusively, but in wonder. How could a Christian esteem that sacred spot! If they honor Abraham, the Christian can not. And this is the logic of the Moslem. The place is vigilantly and jealously guarded by the bigotry and intolerance of the followers of the false prophet. But the voices of the honored dead seemed to discourse through the massive walls. In vain those sentinels watched. The voices of the faithful responded to the heart of faith. * * *

We passed through the graveyard, and along the olive-yard, to the path that directed us from the hill of Hebron to the hill of Zion. The sun seemed to greet us with more than usual brightness. The immediate way was watered by a brook that proceeded from a spring near at hand. The richness of the soil, and the size and beauty of the vines remained in evidence of the "exceeding good land," which had been promised unto Israel. We readily believed this to be the vale of Eshcol, from whence the spies cut down the cluster of grapes which they bore back to Kadesh. The vale grew wider and richer in its yield unto Mamre, where Abraham pitched his tent, "after that Lot was separated from him." We soon entered a narrow but fertile valley, abounding in vines, in flocks, and in herds. About five miles from Hebron we observed massive ruins, probably those of Bethzur, a place of historic importance from the days of Rehoboam to the age of the Crusades. Very near was a fountain of sweet waters. In due season we reached the "Pools of Solomon," those

grand reservoirs, fed by a living spring, whose waters they hold with jealous care. An old stone castle is near, a relic of the Saracens. It is now used as a khan for pilgrims.

V.

We were now within a league of Bethlehem. The country is very rugged and rocky. Nature struggled with fated desolation without the aid of the renewing hand of faith, or hope, or love. But surely where these powers once ruled in glorious might and majesty, doubt, disobedience, and desolation are not to reign forever.

Soon we looked upon the birthplace of David and of the Son of David. The appearance of Bethlehem from the south is by no means striking or grand, although from the east and north it is bold and picturesque. In the blessed providence of Him who "doth all things well," the insignificant village of Bethlehem-Ephratah was appointed as the birthplace of the Son of God and Savior of the world. We repaired promptly to the Latin Conventual Church, which was said to cover and keep the spot where the Son of Mary was born. The building is very massive. Its grand nave is supported by large and lofty columns. We descended to the crypts through dark, damp, and narrow passages. The guide directed us to the traditionary spot, where the Word was first manifested in the flesh. We knew that we could not be far distant from the place, and emotions were excited, which the Christian alone can feel, and there alone. But those emotions were sadly disturbed by the mournful mockery around us. Instead of the stable and the manger, and all the solemn and real types of his humility, here were marble and jasper, here glittered the silver and gilt, here hung the silken tapestry around a gorgeous shrine, and here they told us that Jesus was born! With a heart full of tender memories of the meek and lowly One, we turned away. We felt that His grand mission to the sinning and sorrowing earth was, by such associations of pomp and splendor, invested with an unreal character. We turned from the solemn mockery, ascended to the top of the convent, and looked over the "same country where shepherds were abiding in the field, keeping

watch over their flocks by night," and imagined that we could hear "a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying: 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men.'" We looked toward Jerusalem, and silently descended.

We cherished the memory of the first description that we had ever heard of the "City of the Great King." It was from the lips of a pious mother, and so deep was the impression made by the language of faith and love, that we dreamed that night of that city, and in our vision it was, indeed, "beautiful for situation." It seemed to be "the joy of the whole earth, the perfection of beauty." That vision haunted us in life, and we longed to look upon Jerusalem. We longed to "walk about Zion, and go round about her," and "tell the towers thereof," to mark well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, "that we might tell it to the generation following." Now we were about to realize a cherished hope. We were about to look upon Jerusalem. Oh, would we realize our bright and beautiful ideal! Millions of pilgrims had braved the dangers of flood and field to visit the holy sepulchre. Many had fought their way to the sacred shrine. Myriads had fallen by the way. Scenes of the past, sacred and secular, arose in solemn review before us.

VI.

When about midway from Bethlehem, and near the Greek convent of Mar Elias, we beheld the city. The rays of the declining sun shone upon it. The season, the day, the hour, all combined to make the first view most solemn and impressive. It was the golden month of May. It was the Sabbath eve of the Jews, many of whom were returning to Bethlehem. They had "come to Jerusalem for to worship." Our heart thrilled with memories of the past, as we gazed upon that spot which seemed, nearest of earth unto heaven. There sat the fated city! Not the "joy of the whole earth," but "widowed and solitary." The words of the Son of man welled up from our heart and flowed from our lips: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem; thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered

thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

We shall not attempt to portray the emotions that we experienced as we drew near, and nearer still, to Jerusalem. Our Savior's feet had often pressed the very ground over which we were passing. Oft had he looked upon those hills and vales. The Man of Sorrows had wept over that fated city and predicted its destruction, and the very spirit of desolation was brooding over the scene. The city had sadly changed since then. But the grand landmarks stood before us in mournful majesty. Zion greeted us, and the Mount of Olives saluted us afar. We skirted along the plain of Rephaim, passed the vale of Gihon, between its upper and lower pools, and entered the Gate of Bethlehem. We stood within thy walls, O Jerusalem, and were welcomed unto thy bosom, O Zion!

In our next paper we will describe the "City of the Great King."
P.

TRIBULATION.—It is derived from the Latin *tribulum*, which was the thrashing instrument or roller whereby the Roman husbandman separated the corn from the husks; and *tribulatio*, in its primary significance, was the act of this separation. But some Latin writer of the Christian church appropriated the word and image for the setting forth of a higher truth; and sorrow, distress, and adversity being the appointed means for the separating in men of their chaff from their wheat, of whatever in them was light and trivial, and poor, from the solid and the true, therefore he called these sorrows and griefs "tribulations," thrashings, that is, of the inner spiritual man, without which there could be no fitting him for the heavenly garner.—*Trench.*

O YE MITRED HEADS, PRESERVE THE CHURCH.

AN earnest preacher, who labors with heart and soul to arrest the career of the vicious and turn them in deep penitence to the service of God, is a man deserving no ordinary degree of regard. Were all preachers the noble characters that God demands of those who minister at the altar, how changed the scene would be ! But such is not the case. The Scribes and Pharisees are not all gone from the earth. They are found, in numbers not a few, ministering even in holy things, with broad phylacteries, and the borders of their garments enlarged. They love the uppermost seats at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called by men "Rabbi, Rabbi."

It is to be lamented that, in many cases, the young titled dandy, with much brass and little brains, is in demand. Let such a preacher only have a diamond ring on the little finger of a small white hand, a neat kid boot on a small delicate foot, a fine head of hair well oiled, with wrappings and trappings to suit, and he is in ecstasies. Then, with a rich, fashionable congregation, a fine church edifice, and a costly, deep-toned organ, he is ready to cry out : "A *kingdom* for a *TITLE* !" Now he sees no harm in being called Rabbi. What cares he, though the Savior says there is ? He does not see it so. Quote to him the language of the great Teacher : "But be not ye called Rabbi ; for one is your master, Christ, and all you are brethren ;" and with a hollow, graceless smile he replies : "You know that all men can not see alike." He is a perfect love of a man. To be called "our pastor, the Rev. Dr.," etc., are now choice bits with him ; more to be desired are they than anything, except fine gold.

He sees plainly that men must have some amusements. They are the chief good. Young people especially must be indulged. No word of warning will he utter against the accursed influence of the theatre, the ball-room, or the intoxicating cup. An innocent game of cards, or a "church fair," must, of course, be permitted, at least to the young. A circus is the "finest old" place in

the world. The ring-master's jokes, and the man on his head, etc., eclipses, out of measure, the story of the Cross. The reading of the Bible is dull, and the prayer meeting is a place for the ignorant poor only, to mourn over their misfortunes. "To be seen of men" is that for which his soul longs, as the "hart panteth after the water brooks." But to write an essay on the heartless thing who makes God's work wholly of saving souls a sinecure, is not now proposed. Let me, in conclusion, commend these reverend divines, old and young, to the tender mercies of the following lines, taken from Cowper's *Task*, Book II., 372, etc. L.

"The pulpit, therefore—(and I name it fill'd
With solemn awe, that bids me well beware
With what intent I touch that holy thing)—
The pulpit—(when the satirist has at last,
Strutting and vaporing in an empty school,
Spent all his force and made no proselyte)—
I say the pulpit (in the sober use
Of its legitimate, peculiar powers)
Must stand acknowledged, while the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support, and ornament of Virtue's cause.
There stands the messenger of truth ; there stands
The legate of the skies ! His theme divine,
His office sacred, his credentials clear.
By him the violated law speak out
Its thunders ; and by him, in strains as sweet
As angels use, the gospel whispers peace.
He 'establishes the strong, restores the weak,
Reclaims the wanderer, binds the broken heart,
And, arm'd, himself, in panoply complete
Of heavenly temper, furnishes with arms
Bright as his own, and trains, by every rule
Of holy discipline, to glorious war,
The sacramental host of God's elect !
Are all such teachers ?—would to Heaven all were !
But hark—the doctor's voice !—fast wedged between
Two empiries he stands, and with swoln cheeks

Inspires the news, his trumpet. Keener far
 Than all invective is his bold harangue,
 While through that public organ of report
 He hails the clergy ; and, defying shame,
 Announces to the world his own and theirs !
 He teaches those to read whom schools dismiss'd,
 And colleges, untaught ; sells accent, tone,
 And emphasis in score, and gives to prayer
 The *adagio* and *andante* it demands.
 He grinds divinity of other days
 Down into modern use ; transforms old print
 To zigzag manuscript, and cheats the eyes
 Of gallery critics by a thousand arts.
 Are there who purchase of the doctor's ware ?
 O, name it not in Gath !—it can not be,
 That grave and learned clerks should need such aid.
 He, doubtless, is in sport, and does but droll,
 Assuming thus a rank unknown before—
 Grand caterer and dry-nurse of the church.

I venerate the man whose heart is warm,
 Whose hands are pure, whose doctrine and whose life
 Coincident, exhibit lucid proof
 That he is honest in the sacred cause.
 To such I render more than mere respect,
 Whose actions say that they respect themselves.
 But loose in morals, and in manners vain,
 In conversation frivolous, in dress
 Extreme, at once rapacious and profuse ;
 Frequent in park with lady at his side,
 Ambling and prattling scandal as he goes ;
 But rare at home, and never at his books,
 Or with his pen, save when he scrawls a card ;
 Constant at routs, familiar with a round
 Of ladyships, a stranger to the poor ;
 Ambitious of preferment, for its gold,
 And well prepared, by ignorance and sloth,
 By infidelity and love of world,

To make God's work a sinecure ; a slave
To his own pleasures and his patron's pride ;
From such apostles, O ye mitred heads
Preserve the church ! and lay not careless hands
On skulls that can not teach, and will not learn.

Would I describe a preacher, such as Paul,
Were he on earth, would hear, approve, and own,
Paul should himself direct me. I would trace
His master-strokes, and draw from his design.
I would express him simple, grave, sincere ;
In doctrine uncorrupt ; in language plain,
And plain in manner ; decent, solemn, chaste,
And natural in gesture ; much impress'd
Himself, as conscious of his awful charge,
And anxious mainly that the flock he feeds
May feel it too ; affectionate in look,
And tender in address, as well becomes
A messenger of grace to guilty men.
Behold the picture !—Is it like ?—Like whom ?
The things that mount the rostrum with a skip,
And then skip down again ; pronounce a text,
Cry—hem ; and, reading what they never wrote
Just fifteen minutes, huddle up their work,
And with a well-bred whisper close the scene !

In man or woman, but far most in man,
And most of all in man that ministers
And serves the altar, in my soul I loathe
All affectation. 'Tis my perfect scorn ;
Object of my implacable disgust.
What !—will a man play tricks, will he indulge
A silly, fond conceit of his fair form,
And just proportion, fashionable mien,
And pretty face, in presence of his God ?
Or will he seek to dazzle me with tropes,
As with the diamond on his lily hand,
And play his brilliant parts before my eyes,
When I am hungry for the bread of life ?

He mocks his Maker, prostitutes and shames
His noble office, and, instead of truth,
Displaying his own beauty, starves his flock.
Therefore, avaunt all attitude, and stare,
And start theatric, practiced at the glass!
I seek divine simplicity in him
Who handles things divine; and all besides,
Though learn'd with labor, and though much admired
By curious eyes and judgments ill-inform'd,
To me is odious as the nasal twang
Heard at conventicle, where worthy men,
Misled by custom, strain celestial themes
Through the press'd nostril, spectacle-bestrid.
Some, decent in demeanor while they preach,
That task perform'd, relapse into themselves;
And, having spoken wisely, at the close
Grow wanton, and give proof to every eye,
Whoe'er was edified, themselves were not!
Forth comes the pocket mirror. First we stroke
An eyebrow; next compose a straggling lock;
Then, with an air most gracefully perform'd,
Fall back into our seat, extend an arm,
And lay it at its ease with gentle care,
With handkerchief in hand depending low:
The better hand, more busy, gives the nose
Its bergamot, or aids the indebted eye
With opera-glass, to watch the moving scene,
And recognize the slow-retiring fair.
Now, this is fulsome, and offends me more
Than in a churchman slovenly neglect
And rustic coarseness would. A heavenly mind
May be indifferent to her house of clay,
And slight the hovel as beneath her care;
But how a body so fantastic, trim,
And quaint, in its deportment and attire,
Can lodge a heavenly mind—demands a doubt.
He that negotiates between God and man,

As God's ambassador, the grand concerns
Of judgment and of mercy, should beware
Of lightness in his speech. 'Tis pitiful
To court a grin, when you should woo a soul.
To break a jest, when pity would inspire
Pathetic exhortation ; and to address
The skittish fancy with facetious tales,
When sent with God's commission to the heart !
So did not Paul. Direct me to a quip
Or merry turn in all he ever wrote,
And I consent you take it for your text,
Your only one, till sides and benches fail.
No ! he was serious in a serious cause,
And understood too well the weighty terms
That he had ta'en in charge. He would not stoop
To conquer those, by jocular exploits,
Whom truth and soberness assail'd in vain."

CHRIST'S PATIENCE.—What sorrows did he undergo, and with what patience did he suffer them ! Patient when Judas unworthily betrayed him with a kiss ; patient when Caiaphas spitefully used him ; patient when hurried from one place to another ; patient when Herod with his men of war set him at naught ; patient when Pilot so unrighteously condemned him ; patient when scourged and crowned with thorns ; patient when his cross was laid upon him, and when he was reviled, reproached, scoffed at, and every way abused. Lord Jesus, grant me patience, after this example, to bear thy holy will in all things.

SOME old quaint writer has said : "Dead fish go down stream. It is only live ones that can swim against it." Let all Christians head up against "all ungodliness and worldly lusts," and live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.

It is suggested by a Pennsylvania paper that church pews be placed on pivots, so that the occupants may not be obliged to strain their necks every time somebody comes into church.

THE CARE OF THE CHURCHES.

I.

ONE of the highest duties we can pay to Christ is to maintain the purity of his gospel. Next to this in point of importance is the "increase" of his body. The church is a great gift—among the Lord's best. To bring it up to a high state of efficiency, so that it shall both reflect on itself and spend on the world its whole power for good, is one of the most difficult questions which can engage the attention of the thoughtful Christian. Indeed, I know of no other question so difficult; and certainly there is no other practical item of Christianity which requires for its judicious and successful management so much skill and labor. How shall each church be brought to be what Christ designs it to be, and to do all he intends it to do? These are two grave questions. While in the flesh it is probable we shall never realize an answer to them. But this should not deter us from bestowing on them the requisite amount of attention to understand them, nor from doing whatever may be in our power to make the churches approximate as nearly as possible the divine standard.

On the preacher chiefly will devolve this task. What he does not do will not likely be done; indeed, it will simply not be done at all. The responsibility is a heavy one, but the noble spirit will not shrink from it on this account; only he will get a little closer to God in prayer, and confide more in the almighty arm. The elders of our congregations are, to an extent deeply to be regretted, inefficient. For this certainly they are not always to be blamed; neither are they to be held as quite blameless. They should either not undertake the work, or perform it in a more satisfactory way. To do their whole duty would, in all cases, take much of their time; in many cases, take it all. But this time they are under no obligation to bestow as a gratuity on the churches. For it they should be paid. This is a dictate of common justice, as well as a part of the divine economy. No

man is to work for others, according to Christ, without a just equivalent in return. Were our elders or overseers—I like the latter term the better—paid for their time, as they should be, the following might be counted on as among the results: 1. An order of overseers far better qualified to discharge their delicate duties than we now have. This would arise out of their having time to prepare themselves for their work; and without such special preparation overseers can never be what they should be. Indeed, why should we not have schools for the purpose, and train men for the overseership, as we train them for the work of evangelists? We are at great pains to prepare men to preach; yet no one denies that to govern a church well is a work equally difficult and equally arduous. Equally high, then, is the necessity to qualify men for it. But, certainly, we act on a very different principle: we act as though the school made the preacher, but nature the overseer. The day may be at hand when we may see the necessity of acting on a very different principle. It will be a happy event for the cause of Christ when the overseer shall be as carefully prepared for his work as is the evangelist.

2. The more successful government of our churches, and hence their greater prosperity. This would inevitably result from their being managed by a class of men eminently fitted for their work. But I did not sit down to write an essay on the overseership; yet I hope these few hints will have the careful thought of our brethren.

II.

To return, then, I soberly ask the question: What substantial progress have our churches made within the last ten years? If they have moved forward one degree on the scale of progress, sure I am that they have not moved forward more. We stand now about where we stood ten years ago. In the item of liberality there has been a perceptible advance; but in that of studying the Holy Scriptures a perceptible falling back. Upon the whole, then, I set down our progress at nothing. True, in some localities we have added numbers; but I am sorry to say that with numbers we have not always added strength. Eternity alone will disclose whether many of our successful, protracted meetings

are a blessing to the church, or the reverse. They generally consist of a series of heated discourses, delivered exclusively to the sinner, to induce him to become obedient to Christ. They are destitute, for the most part, of instruction to the disciples. The result is, that the sinner, entering the church with little knowledge of his duties as a Christian, and receiving little proper instruction after he comes in, lives far below the sublime, active life he should live. For this, in many cases, he is to be more pitied than blamed. *The character of these meetings should undergo a material change.* Not that they should be made less profitable to the sinner; only they should be rendered far more so to the saint. They present a happy opportunity of imbuing the mind with holy resolutions. Now is the time to make the young disciple determine that he will never, health permitting, be absent from the house of God even one Lord's day in the year; that he will not forget his daily prayers; that he will daily read the Holy Scriptures; and, if need be, that he will toil with his own hands, that he may have to contribute to the many wants of the church. Let the Christian grow old before his attention is called to these things, and the call will have but a feeble impression on him. When the spirit is young in Christ, is glowing with love to him, is heated with a desire to do his will, then is the time to mold it for high and holy deeds.

Accordingly, for the last two years my own course has been, in all the meetings I have held, and they have all been protracted, to deliver alternately one discourse to the world and one to the church. With the effect I have had high reason to be satisfied. During these meetings the hearts of the brethren generally grow warm, their ancient zeal reburns again, and their spirits become tender and susceptible. Now is the time to urge reforms and suggest new steps. You will be kindly heard, and your propositions responded to with a heart and will never witnessed in a cold, regular meeting. A stale lecture, on the necessity of family prayer, delivered on Saturday, at eleven o'clock, at a monotonous monthly meeting, is about as fruitless of good as any act a Christian man can well perform. The wonder is that churches even live despite of such lectures, not that they do not

flourish under them. But a luminous and animated speech on the subject, at some fitting season during a protracted meeting, causing it to sparkle with vitality, will never fail to end in good. The purpose of a whole congregation can be formed by one such speech. Fifty unlike it, and at other times, will achieve nothing. But I seem wandering again.

III.

There now exists a broad inexorable necessity for a great material reformation in several items in our churches. The two of which I shall at present speak, are the regular weekly assembling of the saints, and universal congregational prayer.

1. The regular Lord's day meetings. Were these meetings what they indisputably ought to be, their influence for good could be estimated only by a knowledge of the actual results. How much it is to be regretted that we have no faultless examples of the kind to which reference might be made. Our churches, in this respect, are certainly far below what they should be. Is not a grand reformation in the item an attainable result? I believe it is, and here and now call the attention of all our preachers to it. Let us all make the point a specialty for 1868. In the end I feel sure we shall have reason to be thankful, and work on.

To the preacher, then, I say, speak first, very privately, to each individual member in the church to which you minister, and request an uninterrupted attendance on every First day of the Week during the entire year. Into this request throw the whole energy of your soul. Let it be a warm, impressible appeal, one that comes gushing from a heart replete with subtle Christian love. Breathe into it the magnetism of a soul heroically bent on a great end. Mark me, your appeal will not be lost. Imbue every mind with your own earnest spirit and holy purpose; and resolve to be satisfied with nothing short of complete success, and complete success will crown your effort.

To my brethren everywhere who are not preachers, I beg to say, see to it that you each and all exert yourselves to bring to pass the end here proposed. To stimulate, if not to ennoble you. tell me how you like the following :

In the modest little town of Say, State of —, we have an elect flock of disciples, with whom it has been my happiness to meet several times, with whose life and customs I am so much pleased that I have concluded to jot down a few of them for the benefit of the reader. They are a lovely band ; and my wonder is that God does not take them to himself. They seem to me to have risen so much above earth that I can not understand why it is that they are still left here the heirs of grief and tears.

1. Their singing struck me as the purest and finest I had ever heard. I felt ashamed of my own poor attainments in this sweetest of arts, while among them. Their singing possessed a volume which I believe to be without a parallel. Surely there was something sublime in that ocean of delicious sounds. Their songs are grave, simple, and grand ; and through all their noble airs there warbles a note so plaintive, and breathes a melancholy so sweet, that I felt as though I listened to the anthems of unfallen spirits. I grew conscious that the current of my spiritual life became sensibly deeper and broader, as I sat among these children of God. It was a season of exquisite joy to my poor hungry soul.

I shall not soon forget an event which happened one day, as I worshiped with these pious people. A very comely youth had met with them, and announced himself as a teacher of music. They asked him for a song, as a sample of what he proposed to teach them and their children. I have now forgotten both song and air, and am thankful I have. I only remember that each verse ended in a rollicking chorus, in which I recollect these words often recurred :

“ Yonder over the rolling river.”

The gusto with which this silly Jim Crow lay was executed constituted the most grotesque interlude it was ever my misfortune to witness. The young man was affectionately commended to the guidance of Him who doeth all things well, and delicately informed that his art was not then in requisition.

2. These people seemed to live for little else than the glorious First day of the Week. Its departure filled them with regret, its

approach with holy joy. Truly, with them, it was the golden day of the seven. They hailed its dawn with soul-felt hymns and grateful prayers. It was the day on which that happy family were to meet each other again in the flesh. The heart of the school child, full ten months absent from home, hardly looks forward to the day of its return with deeper delight than did these disciples to that holy occasion. At a very early hour they all came together into their lovely meeting-house—a house most free from all ostentation, and yet so clean and pure as to suggest no idea but that of Paradise. It stood embowered in the shade of noble forest trees, with here and there a cluster of exquisite flowering shrubs. It was a place where the pious soul would instinctively linger to muse on its hopes and destiny. There in that house and amidst these trees, most of the day was spent. Each disciple brought with him a frugal meal—a bit of cheese and piece of bread, of which all partook in common. The day thus passed amidst songs, readings of the Holy Scriptures, prayers, and conversations touching Christ, and the contents of the Bible. A more delightful scene on earth I can not imagine.

But the circumstance which most of all struck me was the fact that, be the day hot or cold, wet or dry, every disciple, unless prevented by sickness, was present at the meeting. No one ever thought of being absent, if to be present was reasonable. To this habit they were most religiously trained. They dared not, they said, offend the Savior by neglecting to assemble themselves together; and if the precept meant not every Lord's day, they argued that it was open to a most licentious, and therefore a most dangerous construction. They hence met from the double motive, that it was a deep pleasure and the discharge of a sacred duty. The influence of their example was most salutary. The whole community pointed to them as a living illustration of the fervent love enjoined in the word of God. "These people are Christians indeed," was the world's never-changing verdict.

Now, why should not this be the fact and the history of every church of Christ in the whole land? Surely it is right. Bravely, then, and persistently, let us all work for it during the present year. I feel thoroughly convinced that it only needs the unremitt-

ting attention of the preachers to effect in the item large and most gratifying reforms.

IV.

The next item to which I invite attention is that of universal congregational prayer. By this I mean that each member in the church, whether male or female, shall pray publicly whenever called on. But I must qualify and distinguish. I do not mean that women shall teach in public, nor even so much as publicly ask a question for information. These acts are not allowable in the churches of Christ. But I do mean that they should pray, only they are always to pray with the head veiled or covered. In this I am not following discretion, but divine prescription. But for the end here proposed, the children of the Lord will have to be specially educated. The present state of imperfect church training is very unfriendly to it. Indeed it might almost be pronounced hostile. Therefore till it is made to yield to the right, complete success is not attainable. And why should not the children of God be actually and practically taught how to pray, just as they are taught how to read? We are at great pains to teach our children how to write, how to work arithmetic, how to draw diagrams in geometry, and how to till the ground. Are the interests of eternity of less moment than these? Shall not the acts, therefore, by which its blessedness is attained, be taught to say no more, with equal care? This question needs no answer. I have never been able to see why the young disciple should not be taught by actual example how to pray, just as he is taught the other duties of life. The habit thus formed would be permanent, and the effect most salutary.

A lad, say of fifteen, joins the church. He is timid and awkward, but willing. In what lies the objection to the following? I say to this babe in Christ: Come, Samuel, away with me; I have business with you. I take the boy with me into a private room—a closet of prayer, and shut the door. I say to him: My son, I am about to teach you how to pray. Kneel with me. We bow together. I say to him: Repeat after me. I slowly articulate the following, which he says after me:

Our Father in heaven, smile in mercy on us now. Forgive the offenses of the day. Accept our gratitude for our bread and clothing. In all time to come, lead us in the way of life. Never suffer us to be overcome by temptation. Aid us through life to serve thee with fidelity; and at last save us in Christ. Amen.

Two points I have now gained: 1. The boy is emboldened by my example to feel that a prayer may be very short. 2. That it may be very simple. With this feeling goes half his embarrassment in praying. Cultivate him thus for a while; familiarize his mind to the fact that he is expected soon to take part in the public exercises of the church; and by the time the end of a month has been reached he will be ready for the work. Thus let each and every member of the body be trained till all can pray, and not merely all be prayed for.

Nothing could be more lovely than a church molded after the plan herein laid down; every member meeting on each First day of the Week, and each member praying whenever asked to do so. Truly would the churches then be a power on earth for good. Again, then, in conclusion, let me urge on our preachers to make these two points specialties for the present year.

BRIEF BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

“So shall he sprinkle many nations.”—ISAIAH lii., 15.

THIS is considered by many superficial readers as conclusive evidence in favor of pedobaptism, or pedorantism. “Is it not found in connection with the passage which the Eunuch was reading when he was joined by Philip? And as the prime minister of Candace could have known nothing about baptism until Philip preached it to him, in *preaching Jesus*, is it not clear as the sun that the Eunuch was sprinkled?”

The passage: “So shall he sprinkle,” etc., is one concerning which many of the best Hebrew critics have been in doubt; but this does not stand in the way of those empirics who can only resort to the imperfect version of King James, and often in proportion to their ignorance, so is their presumption and their dogmatism.

Upon this paragraph Dr. Clarke observes : "I retain the common rendering, though I am by no means satisfied with it." One reason which he gives for his dissatisfaction is the scholarly one, that when the word *nazal* is used in the sense of sprinkle, the water sprinkled is in the accusative case, and the thing *upon which* the water is sprinkled is preceded by the preposition *gnal*. This is also in accordance with Gesenius.

Dr. Clarke, after presenting various opinions, views, and "*conjectures*," none of which sustains the view of sprinkling water in this passage, still remained "by no means satisfied."

The truth is that he very well knew that there was an insurmountable grammatical difficulty in the way of the common version, and like an honest man confesses it.

The Septuagint has "*astonish*" instead of "*sprinkle*," mistaking, as Gesenius supposes, the original term.

What, then, is the interpretation? Let Gesenius, the great Hebrew scholar, *instar omnium*, answer.

The first definition which he gives of *nazal* is to *exult*; the second is to *sprinkle*, when followed by the preposition *gnal*, or *al*, as aforesaid. In the *Hiphil* or causative conjugation, he says, "to cause to leap for joy; to make rejoice," and quotes the very passage under consideration, and translates: "So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself."

Without laying any claim to rank among the learned, the writer would remind the flippant dogmatists and critics upon the *letter* of King James, that

"A little learning is a dangerous thing."

E. H. H.

How is it that a Christian can collect from twenty thousand to one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and possess it, putting it entirely out of use except to serve his own carnal purposes, and at the same time be aware of the fact that brethren and strangers are in serious need of the daily wants of life. Suffering and destitution in every conceivable shape gaze upon these heaps of dead treasure. But alas, pleading is vanity. Covetousness, oh, how cruel!

THE TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE following passage is quoted by the *London Quarterly Review*, with the remark that, "for the condensation of its wide historic survey, and its vigorous and glowing eloquence, it is one of the finest in the whole range of literature :"

"It arose in an enlightened and skeptical age ; but among a despised and narrow-minded people. It earned hatred and persecution at home by its liberal genius and opposition to the national prejudices ; it earned contempt abroad by its connection with the country where it was born, but which sought to strangle it in its birth. Emerging from Judæa, it made its outward march through the most poisoned regions of the world—Asia Minor, Egypt, Greece, and Rome—and in all it attracted notice and provoked hostility. Successive massacres and attempts at extermination, persecuted for ages by the whole force of the Roman Empire, it bore without resistance, and seemed to draw fresh vigor from the axe ; but assaults in the way of argument, from whatever quarter, it was never ashamed or unable to repel ; and whether attacked or not, it was resolutely aggressive. In four centuries it had pervaded the civilized world ; it had mounted the throne of the Cæsars, it had spread beyond the limits of their sway, and had made inroads upon barbarian nations whom their eagles had never visited ; it had gathered all genius and all learning into itself, and made the literature of the world its own ; it survived the inundation of the barbarian tribes, and conquered the world once more by converting its conquerors to the faith ; it survived the restoration of letters ; it survived an age of inquiry and skepticism, and has long stood its ground in the field of argument, and commanded the intelligent assent of the greatest minds that ever were ; it has been the parent of civilization, and the nurse of learning ; and if light and humanity and freedom be the boast of modern Europe, it is to Christianity that she owes them. Exhibiting in the life of Jesus a picture, varied and minute, of the perfect human united with the divine, in which the mind of man has not been able to find a deficiency or detect a blemish—a picture copied from no model and rivaled by no copy—it has accom-

modated itself to every period and every clime ; it has retained, through every change, a salient spring of life, which enables it to throw off corruption and repair decay, and renew its youth, amid outward hostility and inward divisions."

STRANGERS AND PILGRIMS.

THE world knows not Christ, nor does it know his followers. The character and conduct of the martyrs were a perfect mystery to the mass who looked on their sufferings. The Platonist who made of necessity a virtue, and tried philosophy to prepare himself to bear anything, was completely at a loss when he saw the Christian conqueror meet death in its most aggravated forms with joy. One, when thrown on the flames, said : " This is a bed of roses." Another, overwhelmed with joy, forgot his sufferings, cried out : " None but Jesus ! none but Jesus ! " These things were, indeed, wonders to the gazing world. The followers of Christ were like beings from another world ; so it will be with us if we are Christians. We will be pilgrims, and, of course, strangers here. The world will not understand us. Our motives to action, our joys and hopes, our supports, are all strange to them. For example : that we should have so much pleasure in contemplating the crucifixion and death of our Master—a thing supposed would give us pain—is a mystery. That we should be so careful in performing some duties, which the world regards of so little use—that we should rejoice in the darkest hours of trial and in death, make us strange to our nearest worldly friends. We are bound for another land, and feel strange here. If strangers, let us live so. If a traveler in a foreign land is going homeward, if he has an unpleasant journey, he finds relief in the fact that it will soon be over. If, as he halts for the night, he has a disagreeable landlord and uncomfortable accommodations, he remembers it is only for the night. As soon as morning comes he will leave all these behind him, and be nearing his home. So should we, in our pilgrimage, look on our homes, our lands, merely as they aid us on our journey heavenward. If we have trouble and bereavement and sorrow, remember these are soon to end, and we shall find sorrow turned to joy.

WOMAN.

I OFTEN pass by the tomb of man with somewhat of calm indifference, perhaps may cast a glance, and think of the solitude of the grave, and of the time when I, too, must slumber there; but ere the thought sinks deep, it is gone. But when I see the grave of a female a sigh involuntarily escapes me for with that holy name I associate tender and delicate affection. I look back through the misty past and see her as the young and joyous virgin, with eyes sparkling and cheeks crimsoned at each impassioned feeling of her heart. Again, I behold her as the chaste and virtuous matron — tired of the follies of a gay and sporting world — endeavoring to instill into the heart of her children that love, which, to burn as bright as noon-day sun, needs only to be associated with the holy name of “Mother.” Oh, there is something in contemplating the character of woman that raises the soul far above the things of earth. She stands as the bright oasis in the great desert of man’s life, bedewing his pillow with tears and strewing his pathway with flowers. When sickness compasses him about, and pains of disease get hold upon him, she is by his side as a ministering angel; and when his last hour comes and he must bid farewell to earth, who so willing to drop a tear upon his grave as woman? Oh! proud man, how can you think of all this when you look upon her last resting-place, and not drop a tear? The pages of history have done justice to the name of man, but the kind and unobtrusive excellencies of woman — though hers may have been the genius of a poet, mingled with the virtues of a saint, alike, sleep with her in the grave. Could we bind our thoughts together in fitting form, how fair a garland of sweet memories would grace the head-stones of our loved ones! How green the cyprus! How fresh the lily, white as their own pale faces when last we gazed upon them! Oh, how heavy are the sable vestments that enshroud us; heavy with grief and damp with tears of bitter, blighted sorrow! Damp with vapors from the silent tomb. “We loved her!” Oh, how much

the little sentence tells ! How far back into the misty past it carries us. How far into the future it advances us. When but a puny child, her parents loved her first, and watched her almost every tottering step till she had learned somewhat of the ways of life, and how they looked forward to life's evening, and its midnight too, with calm serenity, knowing that she would gently care for them, and make their night-time bright away, or joys annihilate the sweet sad with kindly deeds. Alas for human foresight ! how little does our caring for the morrow profit us. One by one the most cherished affections of the heart bid us farewell, till there is nothing left for us in this world of woe. " We loved her." There is one who has written in blood-red letters on the tombstone of his desolate heart, and no tears may ever wash out the memory of the departed loved one. In the bloom of youth she stood joyous and gay, but all that's bright must fade. In sixty hours that fair flower faded, and the bright spirit passed to that rest prepared for the people of God. Father, mother, weep not ! She can never return to you, but you can go to her.

B. N. M.

THE OTHER SIDE.

We dwell this side of Jordan's stream,
Yet oft there comes a shining beam
Across from yonder shore ;
While visions of a holy throng,
And sound of harp and seraph's song
Seem gently wafted o'er.

The other side ! ah, there's the place
Where saints in joy past times retrace,
And think of trials gone ;
The vail withdrawn, they clearly see
That all on earth had need to be
To bring them safely home,

The other side ! no sin is there
To stain the robes the blest ones wear
Made white with Jesus' blood ;
No cry of grief, no voice of woe,
To mar the peace their spirits know,
Their constant peace with God.

The other side ! its shore so bright
Is radiant with the golden light
Of Zion's city fair ;
And many dear ones gone before,
Already tread the happy shore,
I seem to see them there.

The other side ! oh, charming sight !
Upon its banks, arrayed in white,
For me a loved one waits ;
Over the stream he calls to me :
" Fear not, I am thy guide to be,
Up to the pearly gates !"

The other side, the other side !
Who would not leave the swelling tide
Of earthly toil and care,
To wake one day when life is past,
Over the stream, at home at last
With all the blest ones there ?

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. V.

APRIL, 1868.

No. 2.

JEWISH WARS AS PRECEDENTS FOR MODERN WARS.

UPON the first announcement of the proposition that all war is sinful, the mind of the Bible reader instantly reverts to the Jewish economy, and to the fact that the chosen people of God were often engaged in war; and this, too, with express divine sanction. This is the first resort for objections to the proposition, and objections from this source almost invariably suggest themselves to those with whom the question is a new one. At the same time, those advocates of war who have studied the question most maturely, find in the same fact the ground of one of their most potent arguments. It is proper, therefore, that we should begin our discussion of the question by considering this argument, and by setting forth the exact bearing of Old Testament precedents upon the whole subject.

The argument to which we refer may be stated, in its most popular as well as its most ingenious form, as follows: God can not sanction that which is morally wrong. But God has sanctioned war; therefore war is not morally wrong.

We are not disposed to make haste in the consideration of this argument, but prefer to linger upon it until its merits are fully exhibited and made quite familiar to the mind of the reader. We will not, therefore, attempt its refutation in the most direct method, until after we shall have approached it somewhat indirectly. The advantages of this course will be apparent, we trust, as we proceed.

It is sometimes well, in considering an argument, to first note the consequences involved in the supposition of its validity. Such a course quite frequently reduces to a very bald absurdity an

argument which, in any other way, can be refuted only by uncommon logical skill. Observe, then, some of the consequences involved in the argument just stated. If valid at all, it must be so in reference to the character of the wars included in the minor premise, as certainly as in reference to war in the abstract. For if God can not sanction that which is morally wrong, he certainly can not and has not sanctioned wars which are wrong in their character. In other words, God can not sanction a wicked war; and to the full extent that his sanction justifies war, it justifies wars of the same character with those which he has sanctioned. If such wars are justified, then nations, and even Christians, may innocently engage in them. But the very first war which the Jews were commanded to undertake was a war of invasion, conquest, pillage, and extermination. They entered the land of Canaan not in self-defense, but to exterminate the native tribes, to seize or destroy their movable property, and to take permanent possession of their country. They came to cultivate vineyards which they had not planted, and to dwell in houses which they had not built. In a subsequent age King Saul, with the sanction of God, undertook a similar war against the Amalekites, sparing neither age, sex, nor condition, but putting the whole population to the sword. But our argument justifies such wars; and if a nation in which Christians live were now to undertake a war of this character, they could innocently take part in it; for God commanded his chosen people to wage such wars, and what God has commanded or sanctioned can not be morally wrong. Where is the Christian advocate of war who is willing to abide this inevitable result of his own logic?

In the second place, this argument, if valid in reference to the main question, must be equally so in reference to the causes which justify war. If God can not sanction that which is morally wrong, he can not and has not sanctioned a war undertaken for an unjust purpose or an insufficient cause. But the Jewish war of extermination against the Canaanites was not provoked by a single act of hostility, or even of unkindness. There had been no intercourse between the parties for generations previous, and they had, just previous to the war, scarcely a knowledge of each other's

existence. The only exciting cause between the parties was a desire on the part of the Jews to possess the land, and a determination on the part of the Canaanites to repel an unprovoked invasion. The same may be said substantially of Saul's war against the Amalekites. The only complaint of the Jews alleged in the history is, that the ancestors of the Amalekites, nearly five hundred years before, had attacked the ancestors of the Israelites as they were passing through the wilderness. (1 Sam. xv., 1-3.) The attacking party had then met with a severe defeat, but now their descendants, of a remote generation, must be slaughtered, men, women, and children, without any new offense to the invading party. Yet, if our argument is a sound one, Christians may now, as the Jews did then, invade the territories of a neighboring nation, and slaughter the inhabitants, without even a complaint against them. God has sanctioned such wars, and what he has sanctioned can not be morally wrong. Those who insist that such wars are wrong, must admit that God himself has sanctioned wrong. How unfortunate for the world's great warriors that this argument was not sooner discovered! It would have justified all the conquests of Alexander, Cæsar, Tamerlane, and Napoleon, and even the ravages of every savage chief who ever burned a peaceful village and slaughtered its inhabitants. It gives them all the sanction of divine approbation; yet, strange to say, it is the argument of men who deny the innocence of any but defensive war. There is no escape from this conclusion; for the fact that God has sanctioned wars of extermination does most unquestionably prove that such wars are not, necessarily, because they are such, and for no other reason, morally wrong. That such a conclusion springs legitimately from an argument employed by those who deny the innocence of all offensive wars, should make them suspect that it is fallacious, for it proves too much for their own cause. They are certainly right in condemning offensive wars in general; and when we come to see in what way they may be condemned, with these divine precedents before us, we will see clearly the defect in the argument which we are considering.

But this argument involves the parties who employ it in an inconsistency still more gross, if possible, than the above. Con-

demning offensive war, and declaring the innocence of defensive war, they go to the divinely sanctioned wars of the Jews for an example in proof, when lo, they find their exemplars engaged in the very warfare which they condemn, while the enemies of the Jews are waging the wars which they justify. No people on earth ever waged more strictly defensive wars than did the Canaanites. They fought in defense of their country, their property, and the lives of their women and children, against an enemy to whom they had given no cause for offense. No Christian advocate of defensive war, had he then lived in Canaan, could have refused to enlist, like the prophet Balaam, in the ranks of the invaded nations. He might have objected that they were a very wicked people, who, if they had their deserts at the hand of God, would be severely punished; but then it would have been demanded: "What right have these refugees from Egypt, whom neither we nor our fathers have offended, to pronounce judgment on us, and undertake our extermination? Have we not a right, so far as they are concerned, to worship what gods we please, and to regulate our own domestic institutions? And when they come to deprive us of this right, and not only so, but to consign us without conditions and without mercy to utter extermination, who will deny to us the right of self-defense?" I confess, that as an advocate of war, I could not have answered these questions, except by granting that right and justice between the parties was all on the side of the Canaanites. Such must be the judgment of the world, when the parties are considered only in their relations to one another, the only way in which parties to any war can now be considered, and therefore the only way in which these facts can furnish precedents for the present day. How wild and reckless, then, the logic by which the Jews, whom to imitate now would expose any nation to the execration of mankind, and held up as furnishing an example, in the matter of war, for the imitation of Christians! The advocate of defensive war should pause here, and deliberate, before he reads further. If he is capable of thinking consistently, he will find himself involved in some confusion.

There is still another unlooked for conclusion to which our argument necessarily leads us. If God can not sanction that

which is morally wrong, then all his decisions upon the question of war must be regarded as infallibly right. We have seen that he could not sanction war for a wrong or insufficient cause; and we now conclude, that, if our argument is valid, whatever causes God regarded as insufficient to justify war must really be insufficient. But, upon examination, we find that causes which all advocates of defensive war now declare to be entirely sufficient for taking up arms, were entirely insufficient then. In the days of King Saul, Judæa was invaded, without provocation, by the Philistines. Saul, instead of attacking them at once, which he was not at liberty to do, waited so long for the prophet Samuel to give him God's permission to fight, that his men became alarmed and deserted him, until his army was reduced to six hundred men. Some unauthorized skirmishing undertaken by Jonathan, resulted in the rout of the Philistines, and the rallying of Israel; but when Saul again applied for divine permission to lead forward his army, it was again withheld, and he was constrained to disband his forces. (1 Sam. xiii. and xiv.)

Later in the reign of Saul, the Philistines once more invaded his kingdom with no wrong to redress, and when he applied for divine permission to repel them, "The Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." But so anxious was he to fight, that he induced the witch of Endor to call up the dead prophet Samuel, that he might ask permission through him. When the spirit of Samuel appeared, Saul said to him: "I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God has departed from me, and answers me no more, neither by prophets nor by dreams; therefore I have called you, that you may make known to me what I shall do." The prophet replied: "Why do you ask me, seeing the Lord has departed from you and become your enemy?" He gave him no permission to fight, but Saul did fight, and his army was totally routed, himself and his three sons falling in the battle. (1 Sam. xxviii., 3-20; xxxi., 1-6.)

Again: in a still later period of Jewish history, the armies of Nebuchadnezzar invaded Judæa, and laid siege to Jerusalem itself; yet Zedekiah, the king, was forbidden to resist them, though told by the prophet that he himself was about to be taken

captive and carried away to Babylon, (2 Kings xxv. Jer. xxi.) In all these cases, right and justice between the parties were on the side of Israel, while their enemies were, in each instance, ruthless invaders, whose only objects were conquest and plunder. The fact that in these cases the Jews were forbidden to fight, shows conclusively that in the judgment of God even unprovoked invasions like these do not in themselves constitute a sufficient cause for war. Thus again, and in the opposite direction, does the argument from Jewish precedents prove too much for our modern defenders of defensive war.

But an insurrection for the avowed purpose of dismembering the nation was no more sufficient cause for war than an invasion. When Rehoboam came to the throne, ten tribes dictated to him conditions on which they would continue to submit to the established government, saying: "Thy father made our yoke grievous; now, therefore, make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve thee." The young king foolishly followed the advice of the young men who had grown up with him, in preference to that of the old men who had stood before his father, and threatened them with heavier burdens and greater severities than Solomon had inflicted. Upon this the ten tribes revolted. Rehoboam, indignant at an attempt to dismember the nation, destroy its military resources, and degrade it in the eyes of the world, assembled an army of one hundred and eighty thousand men, to bring the rebels back to a sense of duty. But Shemaiah, the prophet of God, commanded that the army should be disbanded, "and they returned every man to his house." (1 Kings xii.) The revolution was effected without the shedding of blood, and the proud young king was compelled, by the express command of God, to swallow his wrath, and submit quietly to the loss of much the greater part of his kingdom. This shows that a revolt against an established government is not in itself a sufficient cause for war, even when the revolting party has no better cause than the fear of future oppression at the hands of their rulers. If insufficient in one case, it is insufficient in every other case; and if such war is ever justifiable, it must be made so by some consideration not found in the nature of the quarrel. Here,

then, is another cause of war held sufficient by all the modern defenders of war, but proved entirely insufficient by the very precedents to which they appeal.

It may be objected to the argument, from these cases of invasion and insurrection, that the Jews were forbidden to resist the former because they had sinned against God and deserved to be punished ; and that Rehoboam was forbidden to resist the latter because, as the prophet told him, "this thing is from the Lord." But this explanation only confirms our previous conclusions, for it shows that a justifying cause for war, under the Jewish economy, had to be found in some circumstance entirely distinct from the conduct of the parties toward each other. In the absence of that other circumstance, neither invasion nor insurrection, however unprovoked they might be, could justify an appeal to arms.

If the justifying circumstance referred to, in case of invasion, were the innocence of the invaded party, so that when they were conscious of no guilt in the sight of God they might repel an invasion, this would not enhance the practical value of the precedent for modern nations, for there is no nation free from sin against God, or undeserving of punishment at his hand, and therefore there could still be no resistance to invasion under this precedent. And if, in case of insurrection, the question of resistance depended upon the further question, whether or not the insurrection were "from the Lord," no insurrection could, in modern times, be suppressed ; for God has ceased to inform men what insurrections are from him, and men are now able to know it only by the result. If an insurrection is successful, men are apt to conclude that it is from the Lord ; but if it fails, they pronounce it from the devil. This is rather a superficial method of judging ; for God might accomplish good by an unsuccessful insurrection, as a successful one might subserve the purposes of the devil ; but granting its correctness, it leaves nations utterly unable to know at the outset of a given insurrection whether it is from God or not, and therefore the precedent binds them to non-resistance. This is unquestionably true, unless God, in the New Testament, has given some standard by which we may know whether given insurrection and invasions are sanctioned by him.

We now repeat the question : By what strange perversion of reason is it that the authorized wars of the Jews are appealed to as a precedent for Christians, when, as a precedent, they so utterly condemn the party that makes the appeal? There is not an advocate for war now living, with any pretensions to Christianity, who would justify in modern nations wars like some of those waged by the Jews, or who would not justify now an appeal to arms against such invasions and rebellion as they were forbidden to resist; and yet, in the same breath, the Jewish wars are appealed to as a justifying precedent. A more glaring inconsistency could scarcely be imagined. It is proof conclusive that the Jewish wars are not yet understood—that the lesson they teach has not yet been learned by the religious world.

We must here remark, that we by no means wish to make the impression that the Jews never repelled invasion nor suppressed rebellion. They often did the former, and once, in the case of the Benjamites (Judges xx.), they did the latter. This fact might strike the mind of the objector as furnishing an offset to the argument which we have based upon their mode of dealing with other invasions and insurrections. For example: it might be urged that the suppression of the Benjamite insurrection by the command of God, proves that insurrection was a sufficient cause for war. But this would be to represent God as acting capriciously, as permitting war at one time and forbidding it at another, when the cause for war was in both cases the same. Such a representation is inconsistent with the character of God. Undoubtedly he acted in both cases from some uniform principle, and the reason of the difference is, that in the one case the justifying circumstance to which we have referred above was present; in the other it was absent. This very diversity of conduct, therefore, shows that neither the invasion nor the insurrection was in itself the justifying cause for war.

Neither, in showing that the Jews waged wars of extermination which would be shocking to the moral sense of mankind at the present day, would we intimate that their conduct in so doing is really inexcusable. But our object is to show that the argument in favor of modern wars, deduced from these facts, is fallacious,

by showing, as we have most conclusively done, that it proves too much.

We can now state the principle running through all the history of the Jews, which justified them in waging wars of invasion and extermination at one time, yet, at another time, submitting, without resistance, to invasion and conquest; the principle which made it right for them to suppress one rebellion, yet wrong to suppress another equally unprovoked. This principle is not found in the modern conception that defensive wars are right and offensive wars are wrong; for it is a principle by which, at times, both were tolerated, and at other times both were forbidden. It is not found in the nature of the offense given by the enemy; for, with the same offense, it required them at different periods to pursue lines of policy as different as submission and resistance. It is a principle which could make any war right, and without which no war could be right. It is the principle of implicit obedience to God. Sometimes, as in the case of the Canaanites and of the Amalekites, it was God's will expressly revealed to them, that they should invade and exterminate nations who had done them no injury. To do this without a command from God would have been a most infamous crime; but under his command it became a solemn religious duty. God himself, for reasons of his own, decided that these nations should be exterminated, and he made the Jews the executioners of his will. They undertook war not by their own volition, or at the instance of their own judgment; and they found it hazardous to have any will of their own in reference to its prosecution or its termination. Because they objected to invading Canaan when God first commanded them to do so, they were condemned to wander forty years in the wilderness, till every fighting man among them, but two, should perish. When they turned afterward to obey the command they had refused to obey when it was given, they were beaten back with great slaughter. (Num. xiv., 26-45.) The children of these men at last invaded the land, and when they had prosecuted the war to an extent which they thought sufficient, they made peace. But the displeasure of God was pronounced against them in prophetic words which were afterward fulfilled to their sorrow: "I

made you go up out of Egypt, and have brought you to the land which I swore to your fathers, and I said, I will never break my covenant with you. And you shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land ; you shall throw down their altars ; but you have not obeyed my voice. Why have you done this ? Wherefore I also said, I will not drive them out from before you ; but they shall be as thorns in your sides, and their gods shall be a snare to you." (Judges ii., 1-3.) Again : when King Saul undertook to follow his own judgment in the war with Amalek, sparing Agag and the best of the cattle and the sheep, the consequence of his disobedience was the forfeiture of his throne. (1 Sam. xv., 10-28.)

The same principle controlled them in their dealings with all enemies, both foreign and domestic. The reason why they suppressed the revolt of the Benjamites, but permitted that of the ten tribes to go unresisted, was not because the latter was more excusable than the former, but because God, by his prophet, commanded them in the latter case : " Ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren the children of Israel ; return every man to his house ;" but in the former case, when they asked God " Shall I go up to battle against Benjamin my brother ?" the Lord said : " Go up against him." (1 Kings xii., 24 ; Judges xx., 18, 23, 28.) If the revolt of the Benjamites were the only one which occurred in Jewish history, it might suggest the conclusion that God regarded revolt as a sufficient cause for war ; but the fact that the revolt of the ten tribes was not resisted prohibits this conclusion, and shows that while the people had to act upon the decision of God in each case, God's decision was formed from premises distinct from those furnished by the quarrel between the parties.

In the cases of invasion mentioned above, God forbade them to resist for reasons of his own ; and when the whole nation was tributary to surrounding tribes, as was often the case during the period of the Judges, they quietly submitted to oppression till " the spirit of the Lord came upon Othniel," or upon Gideon, or Jephthah, or Samson ; or till some prophet, or some prophetess like Deborah, called out the armies of Israel in the name of the Lord. In the period of the kings, when war was contemplated, a

prophet of God was consulted, or, in the absence of a prophet, an appeal was made to God by the high-priest in the temple. Thus the authority of God, revealed in reference to each particular war, was their only justifying excuse for taking up arms, and their only guarantee of success. This express revelation of God's will not only justified them, but left their enemies without excuse. Whilst the law of defense against unprovoked invasion would justify the Canaanites in their resistance, and would have enlisted every advocate for defensive war in their favor, the principle which governed Jewish wars condemns their resistance. They had committed crimes worthy of death; not, indeed, against the Israelites who assailed them, but against God; and the fact that it was God who ordered their extermination, is the consideration which made it their duty to quietly submit. They were in the condition of a condemned criminal led to the gallows by an executioner who has no quarrel against him, and who rightly takes his life under authority of law, though the same act without such authority would be as inexcusable as the conduct of the criminal himself.

In order to see how these Jewish precedents affect the right of nations to wage war at the present day, we must consider them as if they were the only precedents known to us. We must take the nations back under Jewish law, and suppose them, while under that law, to wage just such wars as they now do. Or, to effect the same object in another way, we must suppose that revelation ceased with the Old Testament scriptures, and that nations are now living under that law. This supposition is necessary in order to prevent confusion of thought, and to enable us to see these precedents in their own light alone. It places us in this singular condition,—under a law which justifies us in waging any kind of war which God may specifically authorize, but forbids to wage any war for which he does not grant specific authority. In addition to this, we find that he has absolutely ceased to communicate authority to undertake any particular war, and has thereby deprived us of the one only cause which can justify us in fighting even in self-defense. If there had been left to us a general grant upon the subject, this might have obviated the

necessity for a special grant in each individual case ; but, whatever may be thought of New Testament revelation in this respect, it is absolutely certain that no such general grant is to be found in the Old Testament, and it is the force of its precedents that we are now considering. The true and proper effect, therefore, of applying to modern nations the law which governed Jewish warfare would be to render it impossible for them to wage any war ; for it would render insufficient the best causes which they can have, unprovoked invasion and insurrection, while it would throw them back for excuse upon one which they can never have, the will of God specially revealed for the occasion. The Jewish wars were certainly justifiable, and all wars precisely like them would be equally so ; but no modern wars can be like them in the one only particular which made them innocent ; therefore no modern wars, judged by Jewish precedents, are innocent, or can possibly be so.

We have now exhibited the insufficiency of the argument for war under consideration in two different ways. By first supposing its conclusion to be granted, we have shown that it involves the absurdity of justifying wars of unprovoked invasion and extermination, and yet would prevent resistance to wars of the same kind. This absurdity involved in the argument proves that it must be fallacious. In the second place, we have shown that the wars, upon the use of which, as precedents, the validity of this argument depends, were such that, as precedents, they condemn all modern warfare. This fact again proves that there must be a fallacy lurking in the argument. We have now only to point out that fallacy, and dismiss the argument from further consideration.

Plausible as the argument appears, it contains no less than two fallacies ; first, a false assumption in the major premise ; second, an ambiguous use of the minor term. To speak of the latter first, it is clear that the term war is used in a broader sense in the conclusion than in the minor premise. God can not sanction that which is morally wrong : he has sanctioned war ; therefore war is not morally wrong.

Now it is not admitted, nor does the minor proposition assume,

that God has sanctioned war in general ; but merely that he has sanctioned some particular wars waged by the Jews. As these particular wars are all that the minor premise embraces, they are all which can be embraced in the conclusion. But the term war in the conclusion is employed in its general sense, and therefore the argument is fallacious. This can be seen still more readily by comparing it with the following, which is parallel to it. God can not approve sinful beings. God has approved men ; therefore men are not sinful beings.

Here the minor term men is employed with the same ambiguity which attaches to the term war in the argument above. The men whom God has approved are not men in general, as would be required by the conclusion ; but certain men whose sins had been forgiven, and who were leading righteous lives. The premises would justify the conclusion that some men are not sinful beings, but they can prove no more than this. So the argument on war proves that some wars, viz., those Jewish wars which God sanctioned, were not morally wrong ; and it might be employed to prove that no wars precisely like them are morally wrong ; but it can prove no more than this. We have already seen, that to prove this much would not serve the purpose of the defenders of modern wars, seeing that none of the latter are, or can be, precisely like the approved Jewish wars, because they have not that special revelation of God's approval which made those wars innocent, and without which they would have been sinful.

But the major premise contains a false assumption. God has sanctioned some things which are morally wrong. Our opponents themselves admit that wars of extermination are morally wrong, yet we have seen that God has sanctioned some of them. Again : treason is morally wrong ; but God sanctioned that in the case of Rahab, " who received the spies, and sent them out another way." The murder of one's own child is morally wrong, yet God commanded it in the case of Abraham. That which is morally wrong, is known to be so by the precepts of God's moral law. But God has seen fit, at times, to command, for special reasons of his own, the performance of deeds which his moral law forbids. In such cases the positive command sets aside the general moral precept, and must be obeyed in preference. But a positive law can set the

moral law aside only to the extent of its positive requirements ; so that such a command given to a man on a special occasion could not justify him in the same act on another occasion, nor could it justify the same act in another man on any occasion. No man can argue the general right to sacrifice our children, from the command to Abraham ; nor the general right to betray our native city to its enemies, from the justification of Rahab. (Jas. ii., 25.) Some of the Jewish wars, viz., their wars of extermination, are admitted to be of this same class of actions, and it is further admitted that they can not be used as precedents to justify any other nations in waging similar wars ; nor could the Jews have used them as precedents for exterminating any other tribes than those whom they were specially commanded to exterminate. But all their wars, whether of offense or defense, were governed by the same law ; they were justified only by special grants of divine authority ; therefore no one class of them more than another can be used as general precedents.

We have now fully exhibited, both directly and indirectly, the fallacy of the argument under consideration. It has deserved the amount of space we have devoted to it, only in consideration of the astonishing influence which it has exerted over the minds of men. From the twilight which preceded the dark ages, through all the succession of wars which have been waged by Christian nations and applauded by preachers of the gospel down to the fierce struggle through which our own country has just passed, these wars of the Jews have been appealed to as justifying precedents by both parties, with a confidence which would be almost sublime were it not so utterly unfounded. It is time that the world were waking from this dream of ages, and beginning to see the true light which shines from these pages of Jewish history. They would doubtless have seen it long ago, but for the blinding effect of passion, and for the readiness with which men catch at even the appearance of argument, to support them in a course which they are determined, at all hazards, to pursue. With the advance of a severer and more logical study of the word of God, which is beginning to dispel the darkness of ages, we may expect to see this subject, like many others, come forth into new light before the world.

"PREACHING FUNERALS."

I RECENTLY listened to a preacher of extended experience and reputation, who, speaking of some other matter, said it was a thing, "like preaching funerals, all outside the Bible." I began to reflect. In conversation with various preachers this subject has come up, and all lament over the difficulties connected with the case—all wish that there was no such custom. None are willing to preach such discourses without the distinct avowal that they "do not hope to benefit the dead, but preach for the living." When the deceased is an incorrigible sinner, as frequently happens, the assertion assumes a peculiar emphasis, which all the people assembled perfectly understand to mean that they suppose the person has gone to perdition. When the deceased has been a faithful Christian, the living are warned and encouraged by his example.

This difficulty is greatly complicated by the sectarian theologians, who hold to abstract spiritual regeneration. They hunt up some remark made by the deceased during his last hours, which they can construe into a "bright evidence" that "he went off happy." The bereaved friends, in their affliction, greatly desire to be comforted in regard to the condition of their dead; and, in such circumstances, naturally incline toward the preachers who can do it best. This pays a high premium for a strain and perversion of the truth. The first, but not the least, concession in this direction is to conceal so much of the truth as pertains to the case. The next step is to exalt the virtues of the deceased. The next is to intimate that such virtues will be rewarded in the future state, notwithstanding the fact that the gospel so clearly states that those who neglect the great salvation "shall not escape the just recompense of reward." The Scriptures say that they who "know not God, and obey not the gospel, shall be punished with everlasting destruction." When persons call on a preacher to "preach the funeral" of one of their friends, what would they think of him if he should plainly declare this fact,

when every hearer knew perfectly well that the deceased was of that class? Who are the preachers that do this? There are none. The custom is to preach on such a subject as will not comprehend the case in hand. Is not that stultifying one's self? Brethren, have you not caught yourself doing this and continuing to avoid such subjects for weeks afterward, because the friends are in attendance upon your ministration of the word, and may "be hurt" by thinking of their own impenitent dead?

It does not appear to me that "preaching funerals" is an unmitigated evil. The plea that it is a time when the feelings of the people are tender, and therefore a good time to impress them with the word of truth, will do very well when preaching over a faithful Christian. But now-a-days preachers are more frequently called to preach over those who die impenitent, and then they dare not preach the word of truth suited to the occasion.

What is such preaching for? Under the Popish doctrine of purgatorial redemption, through the mediation of a priest on earth, these services over the dead were significant. But we repudiate that doctrine. Why, then, do we "preach funerals?" For the same reason that the mourners wear black crape and lustring. Because it's the fashion! Beyond this there is nothing at all in it. But fashion rules the world; and, as it is fashionable to have funeral sermons, preachers are called on to preach them when the deceased and all the relatives are impenitent sinners.

What is to be done about it? Ah! yes! That is just what hundreds of preachers want to know. They are dreadfully hampered by a custom which they fully realize has nothing in it but an empty form, and know not how to help themselves. So many of them as are the slaves of fashion, of course, will have to go right on until the fashion changes. But there are a few good, true men, who assert their independence, and will do what is right in the face of all the forms and customs of society. A suggestion to this class may be of use. Preachers are, to a large degree, the framers of public opinion. They should teach the people better. Just as long as preachers will consent to pronounce a non-committal oration over the corpses of impenitent sinners, so long will they be called on to do it. When we go

before the brethren and plainly tell them the difficulties in the case, they will heartily second our efforts at a reform. The teachers, by just setting themselves against it, refusing to do what they realize to be wrong, and making it clear to the disciples that it is a worse than useless custom, can very easily make an end of it.

There are some smaller matters to be considered, such as the time of the preacher, which he can not afford to misspend, even though paid for it; the difficulty of keeping up a variety in discoursing so much on one subject; the expense to the poor, who must try to have a fine coffin, hearse, and mourning garments to make the parade connected with the sermonizing, etc.

The subject is worthy of attention, and I hope the friends of Jesus will not shrink from it because it is so interwoven with the customs and forms of society.

J. F.

COMMENTS.

The preceding is extracted from the *A. C. Review*, and is inserted here more for the purpose of calling the attention of preachers still further to the subject than for the purpose of making it the basis of an article. The topic is not deemed of sufficient importance to demand a lengthy discussion; still it is by no means unworthy of consideration.

That the practice of preaching funeral discourses, take it from first to last, has been productive of more good than evil, I believe may be safely doubted. In itself the practice seems to me to be entirely innocent; but whether it is always innocently practiced is what I question. That it is unknown to the New Testament is indisputable; still it is not necessarily wrong on that account; only on that account precisely, if it be even of doubtful tendency or nature, it should at once be disused. It is a custom having its origin in Rome; and constitutes one of a large class of human inventions traceable to that fruitful source of evil. There is no necessity to condemn the custom harshly. The temperate manner in which the preceding piece treats it I think highly proper. That the custom is, as a whole, wrong, I have hardly a doubt, and for years I have declined to encourage it.

In the first place, the death of a friend or relation is an event in itself sufficiently significant and crushing. It needs neither coloring nor comment. In itself it rises far above all efforts to do it justice. Such efforts are tame in comparison with the event they describe. A pulseless corpse needs not the living tongue to give it meaning. Like that silent body, all ceremonies connected with it are the more imposing from being silent.

In the second place, resolutions to reform formed by the friends of the dead on funeral occasions generally prove in the end powerless for good. In not one case in a hundred are they kept ; and all such resolutions formed and broken are an injury to the mind. Even men are not at themselves on such occasions. The mind is so wrecked that it is unsound, and incapable of ordinary and normal action. Its resolutions are the act of the mind when in a morbid state. No wonder, then, that it refuses to be bound by them when it comes to itself. I have no more confidence in a man's resolution to reform formed while listening to a heart-rending funeral discourse, than I have in such resolutions when formed on what is believed to be a death-bed.

Again : a funeral discourse is in not one case in a thousand just to the facts in the case. The temptation to comfort the living is too strong to allow justice to be done to the dead. There is sure to be, on the one hand, a suppression of truth as to faults ; and on the other, exaggeration as to virtues. If this is not absolutely unavoidable, it is at least practically so through the infirmities of human nature. It is hence best to avoid action altogether where the temptation to wrong action is so strong that it will not be resisted. If even a murderer dies, and we preach his funeral, we must not say he is gone to hell. We must say "he is in the hands of a merciful God," and use many other similar gentle expressions, which, when translated into plain English, mean that it is not quite sure he is gone to hell. In other words and plainly, we must inspire a little, just a little, false hope, otherwise we are intolerably rude and cruel. No true man's heart can approve this. If funeral discourses were what they ought to be, few preachers would ever be called on to preach them. Men want their dead flattered ; this the preacher knows, and this the preacher does.

Let a preacher stand over a lifeless body, and plainly tell that he was a covetous man, or that he never prayed in his family in his life, or that he would get drunk, or that he had been guilty of any other crime, and he will not only never be called on by that family to preach another funeral discourse, but they will never love him more. But why not? Shall the whole truth not be told? If not, then, let nothing be told. Leave the world to its own judgment, which, after all, it is very likely to insist on, despite of all the gracious things the preacher may say.

Still further, no man goes to hear a funeral discourse with the expectation of learning anything. They go merely as a compliment to the dead, and their minds are in no frame to be instructed. They want the services to be very short, and to contain nothing doctrinal. If a formal effort is made to teach them the peculiar tenets of the preacher, they feel that their courtesy has been taken advantage of, and are not pleased. In this possibly they may be wrong, but such is the fact, and it prevents them from being benefited.

Many other things might be said against the custom, and perhaps some for it, but it is not proposed to argue its merits at present. Upon the whole, I trust my brethren will, as fast as they can, allow the custom to fall into disuse. Let each preacher publicly state his objections once, and the work will be in large part done.

Of course nothing here said is to be construed against paying the dead decent and even profound respect in the moment of consigning them to their last sleep. This we would encourage as cordially as we discourage the preaching of funerals. But respect for the dead by no means demands that we perform an act of even doubtful propriety. It hence can not require a funeral.

Finally, of all the insipid speeches that men make, or vaporings that they indulge in, preaching funerals stands whole leagues ahead. I never yet heard a funeral discourse that a sensible man would not be ashamed to see in print. This is another reason for discontinuing them. When men can find nothing new to say which is worth hearing, and can only say old things which are not worth hearing, they should say nothing.

MORAL EVIL.

I.

WHAT is moral evil ?

What is its origin ?

An inquiry into this question involves the necessity of defining the terms moral and evil.

The word moral originally signified manners or conduct. His morals were good, who did or acted well ; and his bad, who acted badly. The word at present describes not so much the actions of men as it does the principles of action, or the laws of man's being which determine his conduct. Certain ones of these principles or laws, scientifically arranged and classified, give us moral science. Moral good, then, is, in its elementary conception, a principle or principles, which, if acted out, would result in actual good. Evil, as in the case of good, is an elementary thought, in its abstract state, and may not be analytically defined. But we can think and talk around it, and so individualize it that it will stand out in the mind a distinct conception. Evil is the opposite of good, as cold is the opposite of heat, or light is the opposite of darkness, with this difference, cold is supposed to be the mere negative of heat, whereas evil is positive in its nature, is not simply the absence of good.

Evil may be contemplated as both physical and moral. It is physical when the body or any material thing is injuriously affected ; but it is moral when the injury is done to the soul. Moral evil, then, when it is, and so far as it may be, contemplated as a principle giving birth to action, is a principle which, acted out, damages the soul. This principle must sometimes be regarded as evil before it is developed into an outward act, or even where it is never so developed.

Sentiments or principles which may be denominated moral are those which pertain to the conscience. This faculty or power of man's being is, like every other faculty of his nature, implanted

for a specific purpose. Its function is to cognize the distinct quality in actions which we denominate moral, and report the fact to consciousness. The simple possession of a faculty or capacity for discerning good and evil is not enough of itself for the purpose. Just as good eyes are not sufficient for the purpose of vision without light, for or perfect vision without pure light, so we must, in order to make moral distinctions have that which, to the moral sense, shall be what light is to the eye—intelligence. As many things in the physical and intellectual worlds appear to be real that are not, so many things appear morally true that are really false. This fact may be accounted for in one or both of two ways: 1. It may arise from the fact that the faculty itself is impaired from disuse or abuse. 2. It may be on account of the medium through which the object is seen, being insufficient in quantity or of bad quality. Adam, in the garden, could never have had any conception of sin or of moral evil if there had been no law enjoining any duty upon him. It is equally true that he could have had no idea of holiness but for some such a law. So the condition of its being possible that man could have the idea of sin, an experience of sin, and could suffer the consequences of sin, was also the condition of his being holy, and therefore happy. The law was given, and he had the conception of sin; it was violated, and he had the knowledge of sin.

Moral evil, I think, is held to include more than the term sin does. It certainly includes all that the term sin does; and it may include more, though I hardly think so. If it does not include more, then, since it does certainly not include less, if we give a definition of sin, we give at the same time a definition of moral evil. If it does include more, then sin is a species of moral evil, and from its definition we have but to subtract the specific difference, and the remainder is moral evil. If there be any difference between sin and moral evil we shall now disregard the circumstance, as the purpose which I have in view may be accomplished without regard to it. What is sin? It "is the transgression of law." Take the word, transgress, to signify any infraction of or want of compliance with law, and the definition is complete. It would seem, then, that moral evil is the violation of law.

II.

But we propose to look at the question of moral evil a little more sharply. It is self-evident that moral evil is the act of a moral agent. The word act is to be taken to include that which is done by either body or mind. But not every such act is morally evil. It may be morally good. Now it would seem that the difference between moral evil and moral good consists not in any difference of action abstractly considered, but rather in the nature or in some circumstance of the act. It is hence clear that we can not show the precise element in which the evil of an act is, without first having before us an analysis of a moral act. What, then, are the elements of a moral act? And in which one of these elements does the quality reside? Or at what point in the process does it take its birth? I will not say what these elements are as yet, but will allow them to present themselves in natural order, as we proceed. Let us suppose that there are \$50,000 of gold in the vaults of one of our banks. The fact that the gold is there is no ground for thinking any one either good or bad. Nor is the fact that I know it to be there any just ground for determining my moral character. Neither will the manner or way in which I may learn that the gold is in a certain vault afford grounds for determining me to be either a good or a bad man. The next thing in natural order, after knowing that the gold is in a certain place, is to desire it. This is not wrong. "Lust, when it is conceived, brings forth sin." (James i., 15.) Clearly the desire is not the sin, is not evil. With this agrees my consciousness. I am perfectly aware of the desire for the gold even while writing this sentence, but not of any sin. While we must eat and wear; while we must clothe and educate our children for God; while it is true that even in the days of Him who could make the stones bread, or multiply the loaves and fishes, they had a treasury; it can not be wrong to desire money. I do desire that gold in the vault; I am conscious of the fact. But I have not proceeded further than this. Here I pause and scan the secrets of my soul critically. I question it severely. Is there anything wrong? Answer, nothing. Next in order, plans in conception rise up in my mind, by which

to obtain the coveted object. I can almost see them as each one passes into the field of view, is held before the mind's eye for a moment, and then gives place for another. 1. I might beg the officer of the bank to give it to me. But large money-holders are frequently covetous men. I have no reason to think that he would do so ; hence this conception is dismissed. 2. I might labor for it. But I could never succeed in this way. Life is too short. 3. I might exchange my property for it. But I have not the property that would bring it ; nor would I be materially benefited by the exchange, if I had. 4. I might go to the bank, by some means obtain the key, and carry the money off. Now, in fact, all these conceptions have just passed through my mind, and yet I am not conscious of any evil in me. The reader also has these conceptions necessarily in his mind as he reads this page, and yet he knows that he is not necessarily any the better or the worse for the fact. I do not believe that any human being could, without outraging his sense of right, with just the foregoing premises before him, and no more, accuse me of any evil or wrong.

Do you say that the fact that I went at a time when the cashier was absent, took the key from its hiding-place, unlocked the door of the safe, and carried off the money, must fix the stain of guilt upon me ? I think differently. Suppose the cashier should come into court and testify that he had authorized me to do just what I had done ; I would, of course, be pronounced innocent. But suppose it should be in evidence that I had done the deed, as above, without the consent and against the will of the lawful owners, would I then be guilty of evil ? I think the decision of this question would turn on the proper decision of some questions not yet before us. It might appear that I was lunatic ; in which case the sentiment of man universally is, that I am not guilty. Though it might be right to restrain me, it would be wrong to punish me as an evil-doer. Thus it seems that intelligence, or rather intellectual capacity, is one necessary element of a moral act. And this intelligence must have a certain extent. The brute is intelligent, but not sufficiently so to render it capable of a moral act. So all men decide. Of its extent we will speak hereafter.

Let us now go back and post up a little. We have then : 1.

The gold is in the vault. 2. I believe it is there. 3. I desire it. 4. The conception of an act by which to obtain it is in my mind. 5. I have intellectual capacity enough to see that in performing the act, the rights of others will be violated. But would I necessarily see, even with such intellectual capacity, that the rights of others would be violated? I think not. However good the eyes or intellects, we can not see in the dark. Light is as necessary to seeing as are good eyes, both intellectually and physically. So it seems to me. Paul teaches in his letter to the Romans (iii., 20) : "For by law is the knowledge of sin." Again : "I had not known sin but by the law." (Rom. vii., 7.) The rights of others can be recognized by me only through the knowledge of a law that prescribes them. So the existence of some law which shall set forth the reciprocal rights and obligations growing out of the relation that exists between parties, is a necessary element of a moral act, or of one involving either good or evil. Nor do I think the mere existence of such a law, with the capacity for understanding it, enough ; it must actually be recognized as such a law ; or, if not, there must be responsibility for a knowledge of it. Still further, it must appear to be the will of some one recognized as having the right to prescribe law for the parties, or at least the party must be responsible for such knowledge. 6. The law of some rightful lawgiver, prescribing the rights of myself and the owner of the gold, is in existence and I know it, or am responsible for a knowledge of it. Let us again look at these six elements of moral action : 1. The gold is in the vault. 2. I know it is there. 3. I desire it. 4. The conception of an act by which to obtain it is in my mind. 5. I have the capacity for seeing that I would or would not violate the rights of some one. 6. The law of some one recognized as having the right to prescribe the rights and obligations of myself and of the owner of the gold is in existence, and I see it as such law, or I am responsible for seeing it so. In no one of these elements is there moral quality. I do not mean that we could, in a fully accomplished moral act, have the quality sought without them, for we could not, but only that we do not necessarily have it with them. The cloud is a very different thing from the lightning, though it is usually necessary to it.

Now let us consider that conception which, in its execution, would involve us in the violation of the rights of others. The question must arise : Shall we perform the act ? I will. That is, the will acts. It says yes or no. Two monosyllables are all the words it can utter. Does it say yes ? Then I am guilty. Not one man in the world, who understands the subject, will say that I sinned till this moment ; nor will one deny that at this moment I sinned. For the truth of this statement we are compelled to appeal to consciousness. Having the case fairly and fully stated, let the appeal be made to the consciousness of men, and all that can be done is done. A seventh (7th) element, then, is will. Nor is the quality in the will abstractly, but it depends upon whether the act is to violate the rights of others. 8. The outward act is the last element. These, then, are the elements of a moral act fully developed. In the outward act the moral quality does not, of course, reside. It is always born before it, and therefore without it.

Now it seems to me plain that the thing of which we speak and which we seek is found in the act of willing. It may not be precisely correct to say that the quality is in the will, nor yet to say that it is in the act of willing. It is the *ego* that wills. For doing this it has a capacity or faculty which we should call the faculty of will. Now it is to this *ego*, and not to its faculty, nor to what the faculty does, that the moral quality belongs. But if the question should be as to the time of its birth, the answer is : It is cognized at the moment of willing, and not before. Strictly speaking, the moral quality is in no element of an act, but it is in the actor.

Moral evil, then, seems to be the willing to do that which is wrong, or violation of the known or knowable rights of others. Thus we answer the first question : What is it ?

III.

The second question : What is its origin ? we divide into two parts. 1. What is the manner of its origin ? 2. Who is its author ? The manner of its origin is well settled in the foregoing arguments. Let us, then, address ourselves to the solution of the

second division of the question. It would seem to me that he who does the willing is the author of moral evil. Nor do I believe that any one can be found who is not under the influence of an overmastering bad theology or psychology that would decide differently. This is certainly and intuitively true, unless the will of the one who does will is under the absolute rule of some extraneous power that determines it.

Let the question be raised, and to some it is felt to be an important one: Whence the willing? Is the *ego* self-acting, or is it acted? Do I myself will, or am I caused to will? Or state it thus: Is the act of willing mine, or is it the act of another? If mine, then, I may be a sinner; if it is not mine, then, I can not. In any event he that does the willing is the actor; and if the act be morally evil, is the evil-doer. To this conclusion we are held bond-slaves by the conditions of our being; God has made us so. But, says the fatalist, the act of willing is not the *ego* self-acting, but it is the *ego* constrained to act. That is, the *ego*, acting, is an effect following an adequate cause, over which it possesses no controlling power. Or, more briefly, and, perhaps, more clearly, the *ego* never acts; it is moved by some antecedent force, as the apple falls from the tree by the force of gravity.

The assumption upon which this conclusion is based is, that no effect can be without an adequate cause; the act of willing is an effect; it must, then, have an adequate cause. The major premise here is, no doubt, true. Assume that any given thing is an effect, and it must follow that it had an adequate cause. In the minor premise it is assumed that the act of willing is an effect. This, I grant, is true. But the real question is not whether the act of willing is an effect, but it is rather: What is the real cause of the act? But, says the fatalist, if the act of willing is caused, or is an effect, then it is not free. If by this it be meant that the act of willing, considered as something distinct from the being that wills or the actor, is constrained and not free, I grant it. The absurdity of an act, in the abstract, being a free agent, or an agent at all in any sense, is sufficiently apparent, and hence neither needs nor deserves further notice. For the same reason the mere faculty of will, in the abstract, is not a free agent, but only a pas-

sive instrument. But if it be meant that the *ego* itself is not free in the act of willing ; that it can not and does not itself will without an outside controlling force, I deny it. I hold that the act of willing is an effect, and that the cause which produces it is the soul itself, acting without constraint ; that we are not to look beyond this for the real efficient actor.

President Edwards, who is the champion of the fatalist's forces on the western continent, after demonstrating what no one ever denied : " That nothing taketh beginning from itself ;" proceeds to say that " the will is always determined by the strongest motive." Now, since the act of willing is the product of that which wills, it follows that this proposition must mean that " the strongest motive" determines what the act shall be in any given case, by determining that which does the willing to that particular act. Now, with the proposition thus understood, I ask, how does any one know that the " strongest motive" controls the will ? Is the fact that the will acts, in a certain case, in the direction of something supposed to be a motive, the proof that that motive controlled the will ? Is the fact, if it be a fact, that that motive controlled the will proved by the fact that the will acted in the direction of that given motive ? Then the whole is the shallow fallacy of arguing in a circle. I know the motive controls the will, from the fact that the will is controlled by the motive. How does the President know but that the fact that the will acts in the direction of a given motive results from the fact, simply, that the will-power itself so determines ? Clearly, he does not know. May it not be that the will-power determines the strength of the motive, and not that the motive determines the action of the will ? This may be true, for aught we can see in the phenomena of our being to the contrary. It certainly does no violence to any psychological principle, or fact known to philosophy. But I think there are stubborn facts directly and fatally against the President's position. It seems to me that I have often been conscious of successful efforts made by my soul to resist the influence of things called motives ; that I have dismissed some, and called up others, which, after being considered, were in turn dismissed ; that I did, finally, myself determine the direction of my action. If this

be true, then the hypothesis that motive controls the will is false. But says the objector : There is some reason in every case for the choice which a man makes, and that that reason lies out in the territory of the non-*ego*. It is thought, therefore, that the will-power is constrained in its action, and not free. I hold this conclusion to be hasty and unwise. True, we should not act without a reason, nor against reason ; but it does not hence follow that the reason or motive stands in the relation to the will-power, that cause does to its effect. There is a vast difference between a reason and a cause. It is of the nature of a cause, that it is always followed by its effect. The effect, so far as it exists as an effect, is wholly passive. Whereas a reason, so far as anything objective may be regarded as a reason, is not always followed by its effect. If it were always so followed, it would then cease to be a reason ; it would be a cause. Objective reasons, so far as they are reasons, are uniform, and would tend to produce uniform effects. And these effects must always be good, if they are dependent entirely upon the reasons which produce them ; for their powers are all in themselves and of God, and are therefore very good. But in fact the effects of objective reasons are not always good. The cause of this must, of course, be sought outside of the reasons. It follows, then, that the will is not always controlled by objective reasons. We admit, then, that the will-power does not act without a reason ; still it is true that it determines for itself the reason for its action. This reason is frequently, in the concrete, bad ; whereas, in the abstract, or as an objective thing, it is never bad. Hence the ultimate controlling power is not in the reason, but in the reasoner.

IV.

It is further held that it is inconceivable that the soul itself can will, or act in the matter of willing, without some antecedent power binding it to act. But God wills, and that, too, without any such antecedent power exerted over his will-power. So we must believe. He certainly could have made man with a like capacity, if he had willed to do so. To say that he did not do so, is to absurdly beg the question. To prove that he did not do so, is

what no one has done or can do. I believe it to be most in harmony with all the known phenomena of the soul's action to think that God did make man like himself, capable of willing without the influence of an antecedent controlling power exerted over him. If this be not true, then man is not the author of moral evil in any case.

It has already been stated that abstract motives possess no moral quality, either good or bad, which they are of themselves capable of imparting. Indeed, they possess no such quality. But if it must be conceded that qualities in outward objects exert a controlling power over the soul, causing and determining its acts of will, then, since man is not the author of these controlling outward objects, nor of their powers which determine the will, he is not the author of any act of volition. But we have seen that moral evil arises out of certain volitions; hence man is not, on this assumption, the author of moral evil. The objects that possess the qualities which serve to control the will are themselves, with their qualities, effects, and have their cause or author in God. The controlling power exerted by them is, therefore, only instrumental, whereas the real actor is God. That is, God does actually and absolutely control the will. Hence he is the author of moral evil. But this conclusion, legitimate and necessary as it is from the premises, is false and inadmissible. Therefore the hypothesis from which it comes is false also.

It is contended that God has put within man certain dispositions or capacities, and that he has created outward objects invested with certain qualities so adjusted to these capacities, that the soul of man is always caused, in the absolute and efficient sense of that term, to will certain things. That, in the language of dialecticians, the *non-ego* controls and determines the action of the *ego*. Is this true? If so, it is impossible to believe that man is the author of sin in any sense. Whoever may be its author, man is not.

A knowledge of that gold in the vault excited my desire. That desire is the motive power of the fatalist. The desire to regard, or not to violate the rights of others is also a motive power. The fact that there is no way in which I might obtain the gold except

by stealing it, does not lessen my desire for it. These two motive powers are now in conflict. In the case of some men the preponderance of power is decidedly in favor of righteousness ; in others it is decidedly the reverse. Now, why this difference ? The objects themselves are always the same. They are constant quantities. The cause of the difference in the effects produced upon different persons is to be sought, not in the objects, but in the persons. And evidently, this difference in the persons is in and of themselves, or it is of God. If the former be true, then man is the author of moral evil ; but if the latter, God is its author. If the former be true, then man is a free agent, and the theory of moral necessity is false ; if the latter be true, then the fatalist is right. It is further true, that the same extrinsic motive power is followed by different effects upon the same person at different times. At one time he indignantly refuses to steal the \$50,000 ; whereas, at another time near by, and with other influences essentially the same, he readily steals the same amount. Why is this ? The motive power, in itself, continued the same. Hence the difference in the result is found to be, not in the motive, but, as before, in the man, or in his Maker. If in the former, he is a free agent and the author of sin ; if in the latter, God is the author of sin. Let the fatalist choose.

It will be seen that I do not attempt to point out the author of moral evil precisely, but only to show who its author is in any given case. In the case of the angels that held not their first estate, that sinned, I suppose themselves to have been the authors of the sin that ruined them. In the case of the first sin, the motives which we may say induced it could have had no evil in themselves abstractly ; and hence they could not have exerted morally an evil influence. Neither could God have exerted, directly or indirectly, any evil influence over them. Nor could God have failed to make his angels creatures for virtue and not for vice ; and, therefore, he did make them capable of the virtue designed in their creation. If it be asked, how did the angels come to sin ; the answer is easy. God has a government for heaven, as well as for the earth. The angels were placed under laws which they did not keep. The cause of their violating the laws given them by

the righteous Lord was themselves, wholly themselves. If we argue that, in view of the angelic nature, we can not see how the desire for that which was wrong could have sprang up in their hearts; the reply is, our ignorance is no premise for such a conclusion. Moreover, we, perhaps, assume to know more of the angelic nature than we really do know. Or it may be, that much of what we think we know concerning the angelic nature is false. Why may not the angels' sin have arisen just as our sin does? Indeed, since we must reason from the known to the unknown, we are compelled to suppose that it did. There is no reason to suppose that there was anything peculiar about their sin. The same is true in regard to the sin in the Garden. Adam and Eve sinned when they ate the forbidden fruit. They were themselves the authors of their sin. Their sin occurred just as every other sin does and must. They saw the forbidden fruit; they lusted after it; they took and ate. Thus they sinned.

The secret of many of man's troubles concerning the question of moral evil will be found to be a quarrel with God for having made him as he did. An error concerning man's nature being taken and accepted, a false philosophy, mental and moral, and a false theology will follow. I am convinced that no fatalist understands the science of mind; and hence no such one can produce a correct mental or moral science. His elementary principles and definitions being wrong, his system embracing them must be wrong also.

L.

WITH real pleasure the foregoing is submitted to the readers of the *Quarterly*. It will, I think, be found on close inspection to possess a merit much above the level on which the subject is usually discussed. The whole theme is replete with interest, especially that part relating to the popular theory of fatalism. The influence of this theory for evil in the present day is incalculable. A thorough and perfectly intelligible refutation of it, if one be possible, is demanded by the highest interests of the spirit. The preceding takes hold of it with a fearless hand. Who will say next? Let not the discussion rest here.

STATE OF THE WORLD AT THE COMING OF CHRIST.

I.

WHEN will Christ come again? is a question of profound significance; but till the event itself happens, it will never be satisfactorily answered. About the time we may be permitted to know; but the day itself we shall not. The Jews could not forecast the day on which Christ first came; yet the Jews had as reliable and I deem as ample data on which to base calculations in regard to that coming, as we have in regard to the second coming. Their failure should go far to warrant belief in ours. That the Jews were profoundly solicitous to know the time when their Messiah would appear will not be denied; yet they did not therefore know it. They only knew about the time. Or, in other words, when the time itself did fully come, they had a deep conviction that some great event was near. What, they could not precisely say. They rather hoped that Christ was about to be born than knew it. So I feel it will be when Christ comes a second time. Our souls will be oppressed with the conviction that something great is about to happen. We will hope it is the Savior's return; and so it will be. But this fact we will not certainly know till it bursts upon us.

In these convictions, I feel fully sustained by Holy Writ; and in evidence cite the following: "But of that day and hour no man knows, not even the angels of heaven, but my Father only. But as the days of Noah were, so also will be the coming of the Son of man. For as in the days before the Flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day Noah went into the ark; and they knew not until the Flood came and destroyed them all. Thus also will be the coming of the Son of man."

In this passage the coming of Christ is expressly named; and since the coming is unqualified, it must be taken strictly to denote his literal second coming. The time of this coming is compared

with the time of the Flood, and the state of knowledge then as to the Flood, with the state of knowledge when Christ returns as to the return. Men did not know that the Flood was coming, till it took them all. Thus men will not know that Christ is coming, till he stands among them. This is almost, if not quite, final.

Again : " But of the times and seasons, brethren, you have no need that I write to you. For you yourselves know perfectly, that as a thief in the night, so comes the day of the Lord." That is, if anything more be needed, as the thief comes in an unknown hour of the night, thus at an unknown time will the Son of man come. The exact time of his coming, then, I conclude, is utterly hid from his creatures. Even the angels do not know it. But why ? The question is curious, and opens a rich vein of thought. Would the secret not be safe with the angels ? If so, why keep it from them ? But if not safe, to whom might they impart it ? Pause, reader, and think here. Let us remember, first, that these angels sometimes act unwisely. So at least God charges. Second, that they feel a deep interest in man. Hence their joy over the sinner that repents. Third, that they are sent out as servants to minister to the children of God. Now can it be possible that, were this secret intrusted to them, they might some time in their ministrations whisper it in the ear of some poor sorrowing child of earth ? I can not say ; but I am told that they know not the time.

I hence have no faith in those calculations of men in which the attempt is made to fix the year or the day of Christ's return. If angels do not know that time, sure I am that men do not. Besides, too many of these calculations have already turned out false to justify us in reposing much confidence in them now. When men affect to know what God deems best to hide from angels, he is not likely to put himself to much trouble to verify their pretensions, or bring their prophecies to pass.

But Christ is to return to this earth a second time, to return to it in his own proper person, to return to it literally and really, and in no qualified sense. Not only so, but when he comes he will remain here with his children. Whatever he taught his disciples to pray for is right, absolutely right ; and in the end the absolutely right must prevail. He taught his disciples to pray that his will

might be done on earth as in heaven. Hence the time will come when this will be done. Consequently there comes a time when there will no more be a sin committed on earth than there now is in heaven. Why should not Christ then dwell here as well as there? He must dwell somewhere, and just as well on earth as elsewhere. I have never seen a reason why this should not be his immediate habitation as well as any other spot in the universe. He can have no antipathy to earth; and surely he can just as well create and govern from this place, as from any other.

But this is not the question. The question is, What will be the state of the world when Christ comes? In other words, what will be the condition of mankind? Will they be in the same condition precisely in which they are to-day? And if not, in what will the difference consist?

It is really strange that there should ever have existed even so much as two answers to this question; yet the number has been not simply two, but countless. With the clear teaching of Holy Writ on the point, the views of men should have been a unit. Indeed, even without this teaching, there is little ground for diversity of sentiment. The few and well-defined items on which all calculations must be based in themselves, demand far more of oneness than we know exists.

II.

1. We have the gospel, and it only, as the cause and guarantee of all changes for the better which will ever be wrought in mankind. What it does not effect in the way of human redemption, will never be effected. Nay, more; what it does not effect even in the way of reformation, I have no confidence in as reformation. Changes may be effected through other instrumentalities, but mere changes are not necessarily reformations. Whatever of good is hereafter to be effected for man, and all that is entitled to that name, will, when achieved, be traceable to the gospel. Not only is it the power of God for salvation; it is the instrument of all human good. But the gospel itself will never change. Not the semblance of mutation will ever happen to it. Once for all it has been perfected, and now stands as a petrified, and hence an

immutable thing. Therefore, so far as this one great instrument of human good is concerned, we have little ground on which to base the hope that man's condition between now and the second coming of Christ is going to be materially altered from what it is. On this conclusion, it seems to me, the minds of men should have been one. Introduce the gospel into countries where it has never been; and at once the condition of the people will grow better. But then, on the other hand and to counterbalance this, there are countries where the gospel once was, countries then prosperous and happy, but which the gospel has long since either in large part or wholly deserted, and which consequently are now either completely sunk or are fast sinking into a night which, to them, will be changeless till Christ comes. Thus, while the human family are growing better in one part of the globe, they are growing worse in another. Viewed as a whole, therefore, they are seen to remain, as to their condition, about stationary. Of course, I am understood as speaking here solely of the religious condition of the world.

By the way, what is here said suggests a question of deep significance, as to what is fashionably termed missionary work. Will we ever succeed in replanting the gospel in those lands where it has once been, but which it has now abandoned? My solemn conviction is we never will. When once a people repudiates the gospel, God's last and now only means of redemption, that people will never be permitted to hear it again. When a nation once turns away from Christ, refusing to keep him in mind and to love him, as sure as heaven stands, God, in my judgment, turns away from that nation to smile on it no more with the light of life. From that moment forward all efforts to rechristianize it will prove fruitless. There is no more hope for an apostate nation than for an apostate individual; and for him there is absolutely none. On him God may suffer his rain to fall and sun to shine, but into his darkened heart no ray of divine truth will ever enter again. On even the Sahara God is willing to waste the showers of heaven, but on the heart which has washed itself from the blood of his Son he will never waste another drop. That soul is lost, forever lost; and so with the nation which has rejected Christ, and extinguished within itself the glorious light of his truth. It is gone, forever

gone. We may mourn over the melancholy fact, but a remedy for it lies beyond our power.

As proof of what is here said, we have only to look at those countries which have once been honored with the light of the gospel, but from which that light has long since faded. The continent of Europe abounds with them. Language is almost unequal to the task of describing their degradation. Not perhaps on earth stands there a city to-day in which crimes more numerous or more loathsome are committed, than in the very Jerusalem on which Christ shed his blood to save the world. Above all others, it is the spot for which Christ felt most tenderly ; and above all others it is the spot which God seems most deeply to detest. In all the treasure-houses of heaven there is neither food nor clothing for the man who would make Jerusalem his home as a preacher of the gospel. The very earth beneath his feet, and the cope above his head, conspire to drive him thence. The elements will sicken his body, and crime poison his soul, till he can stay there no longer. Not a star twinkles above his head, but that seems spiteful ; nor falls there a drop of rain, but that seems the bearer of some fatal drug. Carry the gospel back to Jerusalem ! So we may, and as well to its sands and pebbles as to its inhabitants. God has withdrawn his countenance from it, and now the ruler of the power of the air revels in its eternal night, and sports over its ruins and desolation. Bro. Barclay spent on it, it may be fifteen thousand dollars, and countless thousands of sighs and prayers ; and live there now so many as even fifteen men to attest that the benevolent work of his heart was not in vain ? Perhaps so !

Before we talk of sending the gospel to foreign lands, let us hereafter first sit down and solve the question, Did Paul ever preach there, or Peter ? Or is it the land in which Philip's blood was shed ? If an affirmative answer comes back to us, let our decree be to cast no pearls there, for the hogs will but trample them under foot, and then turn and rend us. What is possible for these lands in the future, of course, I can not say ; but the probabilities against them now seem to me to be infinite. In all our missionary operations, therefore, if we wish them to prove successful, we must send the gospel to lands where it has never been, not to those

2. We shall have, till Christ returns, the same human nature to work upon which we have had since he was here before. This human nature will never alter. Better it will not grow, nor hardly worse. We may multiply telegraph wires till one shall stretch along every path which leads from neighbor's house to neighbor's house; we may create colleges till one shall stand on every ten square miles of earth; we may educate the masses till there is not left one who can not read Pindar and Virgil; we may move the implements of husbandry by steam till even the spade digs by it; we may manufacture boots and clothes solely by machines, and turn the mechanic out an accomplished gentleman; we may leave to all the twenty-four hours of day and night,—and still, as long as it remains that man must be born again, human nature will be the same. As to other things, possibly it may grow better, but never as to the gospel. When we have educated men and crowned their lives with leisure, we have not thereby rendered it the easier to convert them to Christ. A human society indefinitely improved is still as inaccessible to the gospel as are men to-day. The facility with which the world can be christianized, unfortunately, does not keep pace with advancement in literature and arts. It may not be true that ignorance is the mother of devotion; but it is equally clear that education is not necessarily attended by obedience to Christ. Human nature will hence remain the same so long as it consists simply of flesh and blood; and so long as it remains what it now is, I see no ground on which to conclude that the world will grow better. How, then, is it that men can differ so widely as to what the state of the world will be when Christ returns? Even independently of what the Scriptures say, they ought substantially at least to agree. But very few items enter as premises into their calculations. Their conclusions should certainly, therefore, be characterized by a closer agreement. But we have not yet enumerated all these items. May be the one which induces or causes the diversity still remains to be named.

3. The one great opposing and disturbing item which must be taken into our calculations is Satan. There is not the vestige of evidence that he will not, till Christ comes the second time, be

thing different. What he has done with man heretofore we may safely conclude he will still continue to do. We can hardly expect him to do more, yet it is pretty certain that he will, at least for a little season, but this from no increase of power, but from increase of wrath. That he will hence still continue to tempt the human family to sin as he has done from Eden till now is simply certain. But since he is not to tempt them to sin more, and very surely not less, it hence follows that the condition of the human family, so far as it is determined by Satan, will remain as it now is. This conclusion seems to me to be necessary and certain. We are still to have the same human nature to work on, the same gospel to work with, and the same Satan to work against. These elements of calculation will hardly give results different for time to come from what they have given in time gone. Unless, therefore, the Scriptures assert that man's condition is to be altered between now and the coming of Christ, we may safely conclude that it will continue as at present.

Still it is certain that the dream, for I can call it nothing else, possesses many a mind that man's condition is to be greatly altered for the better before the end of the present state. But what is to induce this better condition we are not very clearly told. Is God to curtail the power of Satan? Will he do, under Christ, for future generations what he has certainly not done for past? How, then, shall we vindicate his name against the charge of partiality for the future generations? I confess I do not see. To allow Satan to exert a power on one age which he is not allowed to exert on another is indisputably to favor the latter. Both, then, can not be held equally responsible, nor both be equally certain of salvation. This my views of God will never suffer me to impute to him.

But the power of the gospel, we are told, is to be greatly increased. Indeed! Where is the evidence of this? It is now the power of God for salvation to every one who believes it. What will it be when its power is greatly increased? Will it be more? If so, it will be a new thing and not the gospel. Those, therefore, who shall live in that age will live under a *new dispensation*, new in the severest sense of the term, and not under the same which

has fallen to us. Does a hope like this await the future? How cruel, then, that I am the child of the present! How much better had my lot been reserved for that more favored period!

But again : is the gospel in its normal state all that is left to me to save me, while the man of a hundred years hence is to be acted upon in order to his salvation, not only by all that acts on me, but by both this and that added power? Then is God the same to me that he is to him? Or can he and I ascribe our respective salvations to one and the same means? Hardly will it be answered yes. Whoever is saved between this and the day of Christ's second coming will be saved by the gospel, and it only ; and that, too, without either increase or diminution of its power.

III.

I am not unaware that the world is looking with no little hope to the future of the Jews, as likely greatly to change the condition of mankind. I am free to confess that to me the Jew is a problem not easy of solution. I would wish, therefore, to speak with much reserve on a question on which it may be so easy to err. But that the Jew has already done his work, both for God and Christ, seems to me to be as likely to be true as any other view that can be taken of him. I am without the semblance of hope from the Jew. To him this may be very unjust and not well sustained by Holy Writ. But just now I am stating a conviction and not arguing a point.

Why, in the first place, it will be asked, has God so strangely preserved them, if he has not some great work to effect through them? I might reply, I do not know why God has so strangely preserved them, and still with perfect safety deny that he is going to effect some great work through them. God strangely preserves many things, and yet I am not sure that he designs very specially benefiting the world by them. From Noah to the present he has been preserving Africans, yet it is far from being clear to me that therefore they are ever going to achieve much either for themselves or for others. The fact of preserving a nation does not necessitate the conclusion, that it is to become the special benefactors of the rest of mankind. At least I do not feel that the fact stands to the conclusion as a premise necessitating it.

But are we not here proceeding on an assumption which is by no means well warranted? Is it a fact at all that there is anything very strange or marvelous in the preservation of the Jews? Especially is there anything so wonderfully strange as to compel the belief that they are hereafter to perform any great good work for the human family? The oft-repeated assertion of the strange preservation of the Jews has never struck me with force. Candidly I do not believe it. To-day there is not one thing more strange in the preservation of the Jews than of Arabs. They are preserved I readily grant. It is only that there is the strangeness in it which is always assumed that I deny. I will not confidently assert it, but I much incline to think that it might be shown that there is something quite as marvelous in the preservation of Spaniards from the days of Paul to the present as in that of Jews. Yet I have never heard any one insist that therefore Spaniards are to be the instruments of a work specially benefiting mankind. There seems to me to be something strikingly illicit in the argument from the preservation of the Jews. Much of their history is bound up in a bundle with that of the miraculous; and it is pleasing to remember that they were once the favorite people of God. It is hence hard to divest the mind of the notion that they are still a mysterious people and that an eminent day of usefulness awaits them. In this we both gratify our benevolent feelings and keep alive in our bosoms a hope which no word but delicious will describe. God certainly foretold the Jews, through Moses, that, should they reject his Son, he would both scatter them among all the nations of the earth, and that he would preserve them while making an end of others. But does it follow from this that they are preserved for the good they are hereafter to do? Rather are they not denied nationalization and still preserved in ignominy and disgrace as a punishment for their great crime of repudiating Christ? Is not this quite as likely as that they are still to be the greatest of all human benefactors after rejecting Christ for two thousand or it may be more years? To balance probabilities satisfactorily here becomes a little perplexing.

The hope has all along been indulged, that time would wear out the delusion of the Jews that the Messiah is yet to come, and that this done, they would turn to him whom they once murdered and

accept him as the only and true Messiah. Time is certainly and surely wearing out the expectation of a Messiah from the Jewish mind. This, I believe, may be assumed as no scant, but as a widely diffused fact. But, as a consequence, is the Jewish mind turning to the Christ of the New Testament? Far, very far from it. The Jewish mind is turning to *Rationalism*, not to Christ, and to-day their great rabbis have little, if any, more faith in the inspiration of Moses than in the divinity of Christ. At this moment their carnality exceeds that of any people on the globe, and their infidelity is equal to that of France. Let no one delude himself with the faith that the Jews are going to become Christians. This they will not do. On the contrary, their mission and work will henceforth be, to be the conservators and propagandists of the most degrading and loathsome type of Rationalism. Mark this, the Jews, instead of accepting Christ, will deify reason, and turn the most shameless enemies of inspiration. I stop not here to notice those passages of Scripture which have been so confidently relied on to establish an universal Jewish conversion to Christ. Of them all, with but few exceptions, I will say, that their exegesis has been determined far more by the favor of groundless but fondly cherished hopes, than by the cold logic which governs thought and the stern laws which extort its sense from Scripture. Most of these interpretations I have read, and in not one in one hundred could I ever coerce my mind to repose one vestige of confidence. If others think them sound, with them I respectfully decline even the appearance of a quarrel. The past has taught me to be cautious in attempts to interpret prophecy, and diffident of the labors of others. Prophecy too often bears a double sense, and in too many instances it may be even more, to enable us to interpret it in a manner entirely trustworthy. This I have noticed, that of all the interpretations of Scripture with which men favor the world, interpretations of prophecy are the most confident and the most unreliable. We may interpret prophecy with little or no fear of erring when it relates wholly to the past and is exhausted on it; but when it relates to the future, extreme caution is demanded. I hence do not feel that any interpretations of prophecy known to men stand dangerously against the views just delivered.

IV.

There is yet another very cherished popular view held as to the Jews which it may be proper to notice here. Attention has heretofore been called to it in the *Quarterly*, but it will bear well to be noticed a second time. I allude to the return of the Jews to the land of Judæa. There hardly exists another view respecting these people which is so sharply defined and generally held as this. The best men in our ranks entertain it. But why? I candidly believe it inherited, and not derived from the Bible. The Jews themselves and not the Bible, in my opinion, are parents to this view. Indisputably they have always believed they would return; and from them Gentiles have taken their faith. Still, certainly the return of the Jews is not impossible; and if the Scriptures so assert, it will surely occur. But that they do assert it of the Jews, and that for the future, is precisely the point which to me is not clear.

In the first place, it is indisputable that if the Jews return to Palestine at all, they will return either before or after becoming Christians. Will they return before? The probabilities seem overwhelmingly against it. They are now dispersed because they rejected Christ. This is certain. Now, as long as they continue to reject Christ, is it in any degree likely that they will be permitted to return? The sin for which they are scattered remaining the same and being by them still persisted in, the state which the sin has induced will still remain. No reasoning can be better founded than this. I consequently conclude that the Jews will never be suffered to return so long as they remain disobedient to Christ. But they will return after they become Christians. What for? A tough question this. The very feelings which incline them now to return are the very feelings which obedience to Christ would have the effect to destroy. The Jews wish to be to themselves. But exclusiveness for any purpose is not countenanced by the gospel. Christians must mingle with the world to salt it and save it. They can not go to themselves and hide their light beneath a cover. "Let your light so shine before man that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven," is a high Christian duty. How can Christians do this if

they exclude themselves from the world? Again: the Jews wish to re-establish their nationality. But a whole nation of Christians is a little too poetic to be entertained by the sober mind which remembers what the state of the world is to be till Christ returns. I do not remember that the Scriptures foster the idea; not certainly that it would be wrong, but only that it is never to be the fact. If the Jews are ever to become Christians they are now precisely where they ought to be—mingled among the nations of the earth, and I would far sooner argue from their dispersion that they are to become Christians, than to argue from their being Christians that their dispersion will cease. If they are ever to become Christians it is not to be for themselves only, but also for the benefit of others. Jews can be Christians as well out of Judæa as in it; and clearly they could benefit the other nations far more by remaining among them than by abandoning them and going to themselves. Besides, the Jews have now been rejecting Christ for eighteen hundred and more years. Were they to become Christians they would be likely most painfully to remember this fact. As a consequence, they would wish to consecrate their whole powers for usefulness to Christ, and that too in the way which would yield the very largest results. That this could be best done by at once commencing to preach Christ, and not by returning to Judæa, seems about as clear as any proposition of the kind can be.

But suppose the Jews were to become Christians and to return to Judæa. What then? Would they construct themselves into a nation. This possibly they might do. But what would be the form of their government? Could they revive the old Jewish polity? We know perfectly that as Christians they could not revive it all. They could not revive the priesthood; they could not rebuild their temple and restore its worship; and in the name of reason, what would Judæa be to Jews without their ancient priesthood, their ancient temple and its imposing ceremonies? The plain truth is, that almost every memory which endears them to the land would be annihilated, and most wisely too, by the gospel. They would have to become wholly a new people, and be placed under entirely new laws and institutions. Place them

under the law of Moses even in part, and with it they would soon utterly corrupt the gospel and eclipse its light. But to restore its ancient state is the great incentive to Jews to return to Judæa. This, as Christians, they could not do. As soon, therefore, as they learned this fact they would cease to want to return. Let them become Christians, and with the happening of the event will perish in their bosoms the last wish to return to the land of their fathers. Nobler aims will from that moment actuate and govern them. They will then wish to preach Christ with a whole heart and undivided energies. I greatly mistake the Jewish nature if they would any longer want to return to Judæa when thereby they could be in no sense benefited. They would wisely conclude that Judæa would be no special advantage either to them or the gospel. They would hence decline to go.

But all the preceding reflections proceed on the supposition that the Jews will hereafter become Christians. They will certainly never return unless this should occur. Are they now likely to become Christians? The event is certainly not impossible; but I think it more likely that Christ will return before the sun goes down to-day than that it will happen. A very partial conversion of the Jews is the most I ever look for. This, according to Paul, I expect; but a very few Christian Jews may complement his predictions. Beyond these very few, let the hopes of the saints be small.

All expectations, therefore, that the condition of the world is to be greatly altered for the better by the Jews may be dismissed. They will never be realized. We are hence still left to the conclusion that at the second coming of Christ the world will be about as it is at present, no better, no worse.

The conclusion just stated, it will be noticed, has been reached almost independently of the Scriptures. It may, nevertheless, be true. Let it now, however, before it is finally pronounced on, be briefly compared with the teachings of Sacred Writ. To this test ultimately all our conclusions, of whatever nature or kind, must be brought. But few passages will be cited, but the pertinence of these will render them enough.

1. "As it was in the days of Lot, they ate, drank, bought, sold,

planted, built ; but the day Lot went out from Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Correspondingly will it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed."

That the state of the world when Christ comes is here compared with the state of the world in the days of Lot, does not admit of doubt ; and the comparison includes just two points. 1. They ate, drank, bought, sold, etc., then. So likewise they will eat, drink, buy, sell, etc., up to the very moment of Christ's return. 2. It rained fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed them then. Thus will the wicked world be destroyed when Christ comes. These are the points which stand boldly out in the Savior's parallelism. The state of the world, then, will be when Christ returns, what the state of the world was in the days of Lot ; that is, will be just what it is to-day, or if not, with only the difference which exists between the present and the past.

2. "I tell you in that night there shall be two men in one bed ; the one shall be taken, the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding together ; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two men shall be in the field ; the one shall be taken, and the other left." Here we are expressly told what the state of the world will be when Christ returns. We shall have good and bad men then, as we have now. The former will be left to dwell with Christ on earth, the latter will be taken in death. There will be good women then, and wicked, as now. The wicked will be destroyed, the righteous will be left with the Savior. Men will have beds then and sleep as now ; they will have fields and be in them as now ; they will have mills and grind on them as at present. This will be the state of the world when Christ returns ; and this certainly is its state at present. Therefore, when Christ returns he will find the world just as it is to-day, or immaterially different.

Several more passages of Scripture might be added to the preceding, having the same force and meaning ; but since they could add no additional weight to the conclusion, it is not deemed necessary to cite them.

THE ATONEMENT.

THE death of Jesus was a strange and startling event. It was the grandest scene ever marked by the dial of time. If heaven was ever clothed in sackcloth,—if, since the first pulse of time angel choirs suspended their songs of praise, and in silent wonder leaned upon their golden harps, seeking to penetrate the secret depths of divine love,—if a ray of hope ever shot across the dark profound of the pit of woe,—it was when the deep wail, the agonizing cry of the suffering Son of God rent the air: “My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?” The interests of the moral universe hung upon that single event, and the result was a grand achievement. Then, for the first time in the long and varied history of our world, the whole Godhead, the full divinity, was revealed to earth and heaven; all the divine perfections flashed out in their transcendent splendor.

The sublime work of creation developed one phase of the attributes of power, wisdom, and goodness of the supreme Architect of the Universe; the Mosaic institute taught the infinite purity, justice, and truth of the great Jehovah; but God’s love, condescension, and mercy shone forth in all their grandeur and glory in the death of Jesus.

That “Christ died for our sins,” is that grand truth that lies at the foundation of the scheme of redemption. It is the sub-basis of human hope, the cardinal truth of divine revelation. It is “the sum of every message from God to man, the spirit of every promise, the mark of every prediction, the substance of every ceremony, the burden of every hymn.”

The atonement has been defined *at-one-ment*—the reconciling of God and man. It is the making at *one*, or that which makes at *one*, those who were *not one*. A breach had been made between God and man—man, as a subject of moral government, on probation. Man, by transgression, had separated himself from his rightful Sovereign. This breach the atonement made by Jesus Christ

is adapted to heal, and to restore man back to fellowship and communion with his God.

Notwithstanding man had sinned, and brought ruin upon himself, God still loved him, and was not willing that he should perish. But in order to his recovery from the thralldom of sin in which man had involved himself, conformity to the law of God, in heart and life, was necessary. In order to secure the end proposed—man's holiness and happiness—it was necessary that this conformity should be perfect and perpetual. The law under which man as a sinner on probation was placed, was in itself right, and anything short of conformity to it would not have been right. Nor could man have become holy except by such conformity. Hence God could not have required of him less than perfect and perpetual obedience. Such requirement was, moreover, necessary to the well-being of the intelligent universe also on trial. Had God connived at sin in man, it would have encouraged others to depart from the law given to them, and thus caused disorder and confusion, and crime in other departments of God's vast empire.

"Law, in reference to moral actions, expresses the sense of the lawgiver as to what is right, and as to the value of right." Hence God could not, consistently with honor and right, connive at sin, and take man back to fellowship with himself, unless his law was honored and justice satisfied. But why could he not? He is the supreme Ruler of the universe, and can do as he pleases, without being called to account for his actions by any one, and was, moreover, disposed to the exercise of compassion. Were God to exercise mercy, were he to forgive transgressors of his law without an atonement, it would indicate that his law was unjust, harsh, rigorous; that he had made unreasonable requisitions of man; that he had demanded more than was right, and that, consequently, man was not so much to blame; that the defect was in the law, and that blame attached more to the excessive demands of the law than to delinquent man. It would appear, moreover, that the law was not adapted to secure the end—man's holiness; or, at least, that it could be secured by some other method, without obedience to it. This would indicate that the divine procedure toward man was arbitrary, and, to say the least, unreasonable.

Were God to remit sin without an atonement, it would imply that he is capricious, changeable, and that his law is not the mirror of his character, and that his moral attributes can not be learned by his word. Such a procedure would unsettle and throw into confusion and disorder the entire frame-work of the moral government of the world. Nay more; it would indicate that God's law was not his will; that it does not express his sense of what is right, and the value of right; and that his will and his sense of right can not be learned and certainly ascertained from his law. It would, moreover, create doubt in regard to his law—whether it is holy, just, and good.

To forgive without an atonement would weaken God's moral government, cast a shade of suspicion and doubt over the purity and excellency of his character, and encourage others of his creatures to disregard his law. No intelligent being could consider his government as good, fixed, and durable. All would regard it as unsettled and doubtful. They could not feel reverence for his authority and respect for his laws. This would diminish, if it did not wholly quench their love and respect for the Lawgiver. But God intends that his entire procedure toward man shall "show to principalities and powers" throughout the universe; his "manifold wisdom," his truth, his justice, and his purity, and convince all of his righteous judgments. He will not, he can not, consistently with honor and right, abate a single iota of the claims of his law upon man. They are founded in wisdom, holiness, and love; they are as unchangeable as God himself, and must be honored. The law is as holy as God is holy, and is adapted to secure holiness in man. It can not be trampled upon with impunity.

II.

We do not suppose the atonement was based on a respite granted to man after his first sin; that God stayed the execution of the threatened penalty in view of the atonement. The penalty attached to the primal transgression was executed to the full. That penalty was death—death on the selfsame day of the transgression. The death threatened was separation from God. Ac-

cordingly, the day man sinned he was driven out of Paradise, and from the presence, favor, and communion with God. This, we take it, was the penalty threatened, and here we see its full execution. How long this separation should continue; whether the breach might be healed; whether man's exile might terminate; whether a remedy might be found; whether man should wander forever an alien and outcast from God and happiness; these are questions concerning which that law was silent. They made no part of the law to the first pair. The penalty—the whole of it—was inflicted on the day of transgression, and with the infliction of the penalty, the law was satisfied. The remedial economy was instituted, not to avert the penalty of the first transgression, but to restore man back to God from whom he had revolted. It came to man after the penalty of the first transgression was fully executed. It met him when the first law left him. Had the penalty of the violated law been eternal,—had God told the first man, when he placed him under law, that if he violated that precept he should suffer eternal death,—that his separation from God, and happiness should be endless,—that would have been a total end of man's probation. No room would have been allowed for the introduction of the remedial system. The race could not have been put a second time on trial. No mediator could have intervened; no atonement could have been accepted.

The first trial of moral agency had proved a total failure; and, consequently, that system of moral probation was abolished. The condition of things which supervened opened the way for the introduction of another system.

The race now stood in a new relation to God, and to the moral universe. They were in a state of absence from their Sovereign, and in a condition to become personally guilty of actual sin, which would drive them still further from God and happiness, without the slightest possibility or hope of a better or more favorable condition of things. In this state of despair and wretchedness hope beamed upon the race in the intimation that in process of time the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.

God, in compassion, gave the race a new trial under new auspices. He inaugurated another system of probation every way

adapted to men in their lapsed state. God's moral government over man continues, but its frame-work is changed—changed to suit the new state of things which had supervened to the apostasy. At the foundation of this remedial economy lies the atonement. It is, indeed, the sub-basis of the entire system ; the means whereby God's "banished be not expelled from him."

III.

The atonement is an expedient introduced into the moral government of God, as the grounds and means of the restoration of apostate man to the favor and fellowship of God. It is provisional, and the benefits accruing from it are offered to man conditionally. No one can be saved through it, except by a voluntary compliance with the stipulations.

The sufferings of Christ were such, both in kind and degree, as were necessary to maintain the equity of the violated law, the dignity of the divine Lawgiver, respect for his person and character, the purity of his moral government, and to open a channel through which mercy might be extended to the guilty, who voluntarily comply with the stipulated conditions of salvation.

It was necessary, in the nature of things, that the person making atonement should himself be innocent ; that he should be a person of distinction ; that he should occupy a near relation to both parties—to the party offending and the party offended ; that he should be a substitute—that he should substitute his person for the person of those for whom he makes the atonement, and that he substitute his suffering for their suffering. It is required, also, that this substitution be voluntary. The law of the divine economy requires, moreover, that the blood of the substitute should be shed in order to procure the actual remission of the sins of such as may avail themselves of the provision made in their behalf. Finally, the substitute must be accepted on the part of God as the moral Governor of the world.

Our first business will be to inquire how far these requisites meet in the person and work of Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ of God.

IV.

THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF JESUS.

The Scriptures represent him as "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" that "he offered himself without spot to God." "He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." On account of his innocency and purity, he is called a Lamb—"the Lamb of God." He himself gave his enemies the challenge: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" The apostle Peter says: "He suffered the just for the unjust." He is called "the just One;" also "Jesus Christ, the righteous." A holy seer foretold that he should be "hated without a cause." The Roman governor, who had often sported with the rights of innocence, was constrained to acknowledge he found "no fault in" Jesus. The purity of his life baffled the scrutiny of malice. Trace him from Bethany to Calvary, from the cradle to the cross, in public and in private, in his words and in his works, and you will find him great beyond comparison, and good above description. On his spotless character malice never fixed a stain, nor envy cast a shade. Other illustrious personages have been distinguished for single virtues; as Moses for his meekness, Daniel for his integrity, Elijah for his zeal, and Jeremiah for his compassion. But these virtues all meet and mingle in the person of Jesus. They were as so many stars in the firmament. Jesus was as the sun that rose in their midst, in whose presence their light paled and was extinguished. "You know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him was no sin." "He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin."

Christ did not deserve to die; for a person of his spotless character, the law had no penalty. The divine government was more honored by his obedience than it had been dishonored by the disobedience of offenders. The obedience of Christ is worthy of honor from the law, because he himself was not worthy of death. He did not die because the law required it, for the law could not require a just person to die. He must, then, have died for others, for those who on account of transgression deserved to die, that, by dying, he might redeem them from deserved death.

V.

THE PERSONAL DIGNITY OF CHRIST.

What was his gradation in the scale of being? What his rank in the State? What the grandeur of his person?

It can not have escaped the observation of even the casual reader of the Scriptures that they ascribe to Jesus the same names and titles, the same perfections, the same works, and the same worship that are ascribed to the Father. His nature is the Son of God. He is God manifest in the flesh. He is one with the Father. That he is the Son of God is a truth which all are required to believe and avow in order to their being united to Christ as the foundation of the Church, and to the people of God as their fellow-Christians. One can not be intelligently and truly united to God and good men without this belief of the heart. It is requisite that every one thus openly confess Christ. This is an honor due to the Son, who claims equality with the Father; and we see not how any one can feel that Christ is able and competent to save him without this faith in him. It is due to the Father that we both heartily believe and openly honor Jesus as his Son. The Father himself thus owned him, and he requires that all men shall honor the Son even as they honor the Father. It is due, likewise, to the Holy Spirit, who is Christ's advocate, that we thus honor the Lord Jesus Christ.

Out of the mass of evidence contained in the Scriptures of the divinity of Christ, we select one on which to make a brief comment. The argument shall be based on well-authenticated facts.

VI.

JESUS, THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD.

The Scriptures speak of Jesus in numerous places as the Son of God; and from many considerations, it is manifest that he is the Son of God in a peculiar sense; and those who believe in him at all, must believe him to be the Son of God in a far different and superior sense from that in which any other-being can be so called. But in what sense is he the Son of God? This question, we think, may be settled even by the testimony of his adversaries alone. While

he was on earth, his enemies charged him with "blasphemy," as "making himself God;" "making himself equal with God." The Jews sought the more to kill him, because he said, God was his Father; making himself equal with God. (John v., 18.) On another occasion, when he said, "I and the Father are one," the Jews were about to stone him for blasphemy, "because (said they) thou, being a man, makest thyself God." (John x., 33.)

It is clear that the Jews understood Jesus to teach that he was the Son of God in a peculiar and superior sense,—in a sense higher than could be justly claimed by mortals. They understood him to teach that he was the Son of God, in such a sense as to claim divine honor; in a sense that he who worshiped him worshiped the Father also. And upon his claiming honors due to God only, they adjudged him to be guilty of blasphemy against God; and, consequently, that he deserved to be put to death. But why?

The answer to this question is to be found in the law of Moses (Deut. xiii.), which forbade any to turn or entice the people away from the one only true God, and to incite them to worship any other god. Any one who was guilty of this heinous offense was pronounced by the law guilty of blasphemy, and worthy of death. The same law required that he should be instantly put to death; and all the people were required to see that the sentence was duly executed. Such a one was guilty of blasphemy; and it was not proper that he should be suffered to live.

The Jews did unquestionably understand Jesus to claim divine honors; and so must every reader of the teachings of Jesus understand him. He claimed to be the Son of God in such a peculiar sense as to claim worship due to God only. When so charged by the Jews, he did not deny it. He reaffirmed it. This can not be questioned.

When Jesus stood before the high-priest, he was asked two questions: "Art thou the Christ?" and "Art thou the Son of God?" His answer to this last question, according to the Hebrew idiom, is: "Thou hast said;" or, It is as you say. Immediately the high-priest rent his clothes, saying: "He has spoken blasphem-

my ; you have heard the blasphemy ; what need we any further witness ? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth." As soon as he acknowledged himself to be the Son of God, they immediately pronounced him guilty of blasphemy, *i. e.*, seeking to lead the people to pay divine honor to another besides the true God. They convict him on his own testimony (having "heard of his own mouth") of the crime which they afterward describe to Pilate. "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God."

No candid reader can doubt, we think, that the Jews understood him to claim by that title a divine character. And he himself must have known that they so understood him. As little can it be doubted, therefore, that they must have rightly understood him. For he never corrected them. He never told them they had misunderstood him. By his silence he admitted the claim, and consented to die under that charge.

"The whole question, therefore, of his being rightly or wrongfully condemned, turns on the justness of that claim ; on his having or not having that character which the Jews understood him to assume. For if he was not such, and yet called himself the Son of God in that sense in which they understood the title, we are at a loss to see on what ground we can find fault with the sentence they pronounced. It does appear, therefore, that the whole question of Christ's divine mission, and consequently the truth of Christianity and the efficacy of his death, turns on the claim which he so plainly appears to have made to divine honor for himself."

Jesus, the Christ, then, is the Son of God ; the brightness of his Father's glory ; the express image of his person. He claims divine honor, and all intelligences on earth and in heaven are required to honor him even as they honor the Father. Such is the matchless dignity, the transcendent glory, the peerless majesty of our great High-Priest.

VII.

Prior to his incarnation he was called "the Word of God." As such, he existed from the beginning. The beginning ! Ere the

first ray of light kissed the earth, or the morning stars sang in concert, or the first angel hymned the new creation, the Word was. He was before all things, and by him all things subsist. His hand fashioned them all for his own glory.

Revelation points us to a period long ere this world was created—to a time when the morning stars were begotten ; when, like drops of dew from the fingers of the morning, stars and constellations fell trickling from the hand of God ; when, by a word he launched forth ponderous orbs ; when, with his own hand, he sent comets, like thunderbolts, wandering through space to find one day, in the lapse of ages, their proper sphere. We go back to years gone by, when worlds were made and systems fashioned, but we have not even approached the beginning yet. Until we go to the time when all the universe slept in the mind of God as yet unborn, until we enter the eternity where God the Creator lived alone, everything sleeping within him—all creation resting in his mighty, gigantic thought, we have not found the beginning. Could our imagination outstrip the lightning's flashing in majesty, power, and speed, it would weary itself ere it could get to the beginning. Yet "in the beginning was the Word." When the unnavigated ether was yet unfanned by the wing of a single angel, when space was shoreless, when universal silence reigned, and not a voice or whisper shocked the solemnity of silence ; when there was no being, and no motion, and no time, and naught but God himself alone in his own eternity ; when, without the song of an angel, without the attendance of even the cherubim ; long ere the living creatures were born, or the wheels of Jehovah's chariot were finished, even then "was the Word."

"The divinity of the person of the Son of God is indispensably necessary to the worth, the sufficiency, and efficacy of the atonement. The grandeur of his person preserved unsullied the public honor of God in treating with a daysman for sinners. It not only vindicated the character of the high party proposing reconciliation, but it magnified that character in the whole of the transaction. He is one high enough in rank and personal worth to draw public attention to this amazing expedient in the divine government."

VIII.

CHRIST A SUBSTITUTE.

“A mediator for offenders puts himself in their place, and proposes to substitute some expedient instead of their punishment. This is the principle on which Christ has mediated for sinners. Thus did Paul in his interposition for Onesimus. He interceded with Philemon, as ‘being such a one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ.’ The principle of substitution is recognized, owned, and acted upon by all men. Every victim that has ever bled on a sacrificial altar, every trouble and expense which it has cost a father to relieve and forgive an offending son, every instance of kindness shown to one for the sake of another, every instance of giving and taking hostages among nations, every honorable exercise of a government’s clemency toward offenders at the intercession of worthy characters, recognizes the principle of substitution.”

Persons who deny the substitution of the atonement of Christ, nevertheless recognize the principle of it by asserting that the repentance of a sinner is a sufficient reason for suspending his punishment; or, in other words, they assert that the repentance of the sinner is a satisfaction to the divine government, supplying to it an honorable ground for his acquittal, and, as such, to be substituted instead of his punishment.

Some persons object to the doctrine of the atonement because they suppose it represents God as changeable, placated and made merciful by the death of Christ. This, however, is an erroneous view of the subject. But the idea that pardon is bestowed upon the sinner in consequence of his repentance without an atonement, is attended with precisely the same difficulty, is involved in the same absurdity. It represents man as influencing God—“the finite, as controlling, by an act of repentance, the unchangeable self-determinations of the Infinite.” It represents God as being influenced by motives and occasions, and as subject to human feelings. But this view is attended with other evils. It tends to weaken our impression of the hatefulness of sin, and encourages indifference in the sinner, by the easy terms on which he

is promised forgiveness. It supposes that God is made placable, and to be softened by repentance. And what moral fitness, we would ask, has repentance to do away with the guilt or punishment of a past transgression? In whatever degree that which deserves punishment is not punished, in that degree God's justice is limited in its operation. But of this, more hereafter.

The substitution of Christ was twofold—the substitution of his person instead of the offenders; and a substitution of his sufferings instead of their punishment. Such a substitution implies no transfer of moral character, no commutation of delinquency and responsibility; the nature of things makes such a transfer and commutation impossible. This substitution also excludes the idea of a literal infliction upon the substitute of the identical penalty due to the offender.

The atonement of Christ did not consist in bearing the identical punishment threatened to the sinner. The letter of the law could not have reached the person of Christ with its penalty; for he had kept the whole law, and was honorably entitled to the life which it promised. Except in the single article of dying, there was scarcely anything in the sufferings of Christ the same as the penalty threatened in the law. There was no pang of remorse, no consciousness of demerit, no execration of the authority that inflicted the pains. On the contrary, there was in him a consciousness that he was just, and that the law did not curse him, and an assurance that God approved his sufferings, as obeying his will and doing his pleasure.

IX.

CHRIST'S SUBSTITUTION VOLUNTARY.

To render a substitution valid, honorable, and efficacious, there must be free and perfect voluntariness in the substitution. The atonement of Christ was to be an index to the whole operations and bearings of the mediatorial system; to point it out as a system adapted to reasonable, free, and voluntary intelligences. It was, in fact, to be a specimen of the voluntariness of the whole economy. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from

me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." (John x., 17, 18.)

Man was free and voluntary in sinning. God was free and voluntary in providing an atonement. Christ was free and voluntary in making an atonement, and the Father was free and voluntary in accepting it. The sinner is free and voluntary in rejecting or receiving the benefits guaranteed to him by the atonement ; and the divine government is free and voluntary in forgiving the sinner ; the Christian is free and voluntary in his course of obedience and holiness ; his admission into heaven is entirely of grace and unconstrained good-will ; and all the employments and exercises of heaven are free and voluntary. Free, uninfluenced voluntariness is stamped on the whole transaction, and is exercised by all the parties concerned.

This voluntary principle was conspicuous in the whole life and character of Jesus Christ. Though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor. He was led as a lamb to the slaughter. His whole undertaking was an act of free choice, of perfect voluntariness ; without constraint, without reluctance. This voluntariness originated in himself. He emptied himself, and made himself of no reputation. An involuntary substitution would have been unjust, unreasonable, and inadmissible ; therefore much of the acceptableness of the work of Christ, in connection with the dignity of his person, is ascribed to the grace, the love, and the voluntariness which he so freely displayed in the whole undertaking.

X.

THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF CHRIST TO MANKIND.

The Scriptures represent the Author of our salvation as sustaining a near and intimate relationship to sinners. He is related to us by office, by kindred, and by neighborhood. "He was made of a woman." "Forasmuch as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." "He took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." "It became him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest

in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Jesus assumed our nature that he might sustain visible sufferings, and endure a public death, even the death of the cross, and that he might suffer, being tempted, in order that he might be able to succor them that are tempted. By such an arrangement, the whole government of God has been honored in the nature, if not in the persons, of the offenders. "If one died for all, then were all dead."

THE BLOOD OF CHRIST SHED FOR REMISSION OF SINS.

It is an established principle in the remedial constitution, that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission." This was a part of the original law of pardon, and has been incorporated into the divine law of remission under every succeeding dispensation. God has been pleased to assign his reason for this arrangement.

When flesh was allowed for the food of man, God prohibited the eating of blood. "But the flesh, with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall you not eat." (Gen. ix., 4.) The divine reason for this prohibition of blood, as an article of diet, is to be found in the design of the Lawgiver to attach to blood a peculiar sacredness from its uses in religious worship. This we find expressly declared in Lev. xvii., 11 : "For the life of the flesh is in the blood ; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls ; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." The full force of this language can not be appreciated without our bearing in mind that the original word for life and soul is the same ; so that in saying the life of the flesh is in the blood, and that it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul (*i. e.*, the life), it is virtually said that life goes for life in the great scheme of expiation. Accordingly, we find it prophetically affirmed of Christ, in undoubted allusion to this very language (Isaiah liii., 12), that he should pour out his soul unto death, *i. e.*, should shed his vital blood or give his life. The same original Greek term occurs in John x., 11, 17 : "I am the good shepherd ; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." (See also Lev. xix., 26 ; Deut. xii., 23 ; 1 Sam. xiv., 34.)

If the foregoing positions be correct, and we see not how they can be gainsayed, it follows,

1. That the death of Christ was not merely a martyrdom. If he died as a martyr-victim of the wrath of his enemies, and nothing more, then his death does not, any more than the death of Stephen, or any other martyr, procure the salvation of sinners. How is he, then, our Savior? By his example and teachings only. He is a Savior in no other and higher sense than the prophets and apostles were saviors. They taught the truth, and the most of them died for the truth which they taught, and were thus instrumental in bringing thousands to the knowledge and acknowledgment of the truth. And on this hypothesis Jesus did nothing more. Is Christ a Savior only because he preached the truth, and died as a witness for the truth? Then are Peter and Paul, and many others, saviors, for they did the same things; nay, they were greater saviors, for their ministry continued longer, and they were more successful in their labors. This is certainly a very degrading and unscriptural, if not an infidel, view of the death of the adorable Savior.

As a martyrdom, the death of Jesus was the least glorious of all the martyrs. Many of them went in triumph and exultation to the death. They even courted conflict with the last enemy, and hugged the martyr's stake, and shouted victory in the flames. Jesus, on the contrary, shrank from the contest, and prayed, if it were possible, to be saved from the bitter draught. Hear his wail of woe in the garden of agony. See the tears of bloody sweat that gushed through every pore. Listen to his affecting cry upon the bloody cross: "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?"

2. Nor was his death merely an example for our imitation. Many have met death with more firmness and greater composure; have been less agitated, less appalled at their approaching dissolution. The trepidation of Jesus is wholly inexplicable on the hypothesis that he died merely as an example for our imitation. Hear his exclamation in view of his approaching dissolution: "My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death." This agony, which seems to be the most dreadful which he ever endured, was not inflicted by his enemies. Yet he says: "My soul is exceedingly sorrowful." Men may torture the body, but they

can not afflict the soul. But when we read that "his soul was made an offering for sin," the whole secret of his agony is explained.

It is a distinguishing feature in the death of the martyrs, that they met their fate calmly, and even joyfully. Witness the death of Stephen. How heroic! He bends his knee in prayer; he sees heaven open; and wrapped in beatific vision, he prays for his murderers, commends his spirit to Jesus at the right hand of God, bows his head, and falls asleep! Hear the triumphant exclamation of Paul, who suffered martyrdom at Rome under Nero: "I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me in that day." How different the emotions of Jesus in prospect of death! He is overpowered with mental agony. Why is this? Is he afraid to die? He sweats as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground. Why is he thus agitated and overwhelmed with agony? Why these emotions, if his was only a martyr-death? But "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed." This explains it all, and fully accounts for his perturbation and agony.

XI.

THE ATONEMENT.

We come now to explain the atonement itself; and we wish to consider this central idea of the remedial system in its principal bearings, to look at it in its various aspects, Godward and manward, for it has two sides—the divine and the human.

The apostle Paul says: "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth as a propitiatory [sacrifice] through the faith in his blood, in order to declare his justification with respect to the remission of sins formerly committed during the forbearance of God; in order to declare his justification at the present time; so that he might be just and yet the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus."

The atonement was not for the purpose of inciting or calling into existence the mercy of God. God was already possessed of mercy ; he was disposed to the exercise of compassion on the guilty. The fountain was in the heart of the divine Father ; but to exercise it—that was the difficulty. As a Father, he could forgive without an atonement ; but God was also a moral Governor. He was a God of justice as well as of mercy. This is the reason he could not forgive without an atonement. The death of Christ was to satisfy justice, and thus to open the way for the exercise of mercy ; so that God could be just in justifying the ungodly. So teaches the great apostle to the Gentiles. In view of the death of Christ, God can be both just and merciful in the same transactions—“ in justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus.”

MEANING OF ATONEMENT.

“ An atonement is a provision introduced into the administration of government, instead of the infliction of the punishment of an offender—any expedient that will justify a government in suspending the literal execution of the penalty threatened ; any consideration that fills the place of punishment, and answers the purposes of government as effectually as the infliction of the penalty on the offender himself would ; and which thus supplies to the government just, safe, and honorable grounds for offering and dispensing pardon to the offender.” “ In the administration of a government an atonement means something that may justify the exercise of clemency and mercy without relaxing the bands of just authority. The head of a commonwealth, or the supreme organ of government, is not a private person, but a public officer. As a private person he may be inclined to do many things which the honor of his public office forbids him to do. In order, therefore, to reconcile the exercise of his personal disposition and of his public function, some expedient must be found which will preserve the honor of his government in the exhibition of his clemency and favor. For want of such an expedient, a public organ of government must often withhold his favors. This principle is practically adopted every day in the discipline of children in a family, as well as in the civil administration of public justice.

King Darius had issued a decree that no man should ask any petition of any being save the king himself, during the period of thirty days ; and in the event that any should disregard the king's decree, it was further decreed that he should be cast into a den of lions. Daniel, one of the children of the captivity, a Jew, threw open his window that looked toward Jerusalem, and three times a day prayed to his God. At the expiration of this period, the king's ministers informed him against Daniel. The king's heart was set on Daniel, and he labored all day till the going down of the sun to deliver him, but could not. Accordingly Daniel was cast into the den of lions.

The king's feelings were altogether favorable toward Daniel, and although he pondered and thought, still he could devise no expedient by which to save him. It may be asked : Could he not have pardoned him ? We answer : As a private man he could, and would have done it ; but as a king he could not without losing the respect of his subjects for his person, and weakening his government. Self-respect, the high regard he had for his government, and a desire to promote the good of his empire, prevented his pardoning Daniel ; prevented him from doing the very thing which his heart inclined him to do. Could he not have repealed the law ? Yes ; but not with honor to the laws of the Medes and Persians. A repeal of the law would have manifested such fickleness in the king, and uncertainty in the administration of his government, as to encourage others to disregard the king's decrees, and might lead presidents, princes, and satraps to disaffection and treason. Although the king desired to save Daniel, he could devise no expedient by which he could do so consistently with his own honor, the dignity of his laws, and the safety of his empire.

Now, at the very point where Darius failed, God has succeeded ; he has found a remedy, and that remedy is the atonement of Jesus Christ. This renders it both honorable and safe for God to pardon the penitent.

In illustration of this single point, we mention another incident recorded in profane history.

Zaleucus, king of the Locrians, to guard the virtue of his sub-

jects, had established a law against a particular crime, the penalty of which was that the offender should lose both his eyes. The first person found guilty of this offense was the king's own son. While Zaleucus felt as a father toward his son, he had the feelings of a king toward his government. If he, as a father, forgave his son, his laws would not be respected by the rest of his subjects, and his public character would be rendered odious in his punishing any future offender. To repeal the law would be to brand his character with dishonor ; for selfishness, in sacrificing the public good of a whole community to his private feelings ; for weakness, in publishing a law whose penalty he never could inflict ; and for foolishness, in introducing a law the bearings of which he had never contemplated. This would make his authority for the future a mere name, and his laws a nullity.

The case was a difficult one. Though he was an offended governor, he was also a compassionate and tender father. His mind was agitated with conflicting emotions. At the suggestion of love, he employed his wisdom to devise an expedient through the medium of which he would save his son, and yet magnify his law and make it honorable. The expedient was this : The king himself would lose one eye, and the offender should lose another. By this means the honor of his law was preserved unsullied, and the clemency of his heart was extended to the offender. Every subject in the government, when he heard of the king's conduct, would feel assured that the king esteemed his law very highly ; and though the offender did not suffer the entire penalty, yet the clemency shown him was exercised in such a way, that no one guilty of the like offense, would think of escaping with impunity. Every one who should hear of the fact, would say that the king spared not his own eye that he might, with honor, spare his offending child. He would feel that this sacrifice of the king's eye fully demonstrated the king's abhorrence of the crime which his son had committed, and as high regard for his law as if the penalty had been literally executed upon the sinner himself. The public mind would be impressed with the idea that the expedient of the father was an atonement for the offense of the son, and was a just and honorable ground for pardoning him.

Such an expedient in the moral government of God was the death of Christ. It "magnified the law, and made it honorable." In consideration of that wonderful event, God can now pardon sinners and still be just, and his law holy, just, and good. It has rendered sin odious in the sight of the intelligent universe, and cuts off all hope of impunity in the transgressor.

XII.

From this view of the atonement, it can very readily be perceived in what sense it may be affirmed that Christ's death satisfied law and justice; and also in what sense Christ died in the room or stead of sinners. It will appear likewise, that the atonement was an expiation for sin. These are the effects of the death of Christ Godward. We turn attention now to these items, and will consider each of them separately.

In saying Christ died in our room or stead, we do not mean to affirm that he suffered the exact punishment due to sinners, either in kind or degree; nor yet, that the sufferings of the Son of God were substituted in room of the execution of the penalty threatened to offenders. He did not suffer the identical penalty due to them; but his death is a provision introduced instead of the literal infliction of the penalty due to sinners. It is the substitution of another course of suffering, which will answer the same purposes in the divine administration as the literal execution of the penalty on offenders themselves would accomplish. This is precisely what we understand the Scriptures to teach on this subject.

There are persons who can see no propriety whatever in the scheme of redemption through the atonement. "So far from beholding the love of God which shines forth so conspicuously in the cross of Christ, they see in it only an act of injustice and cruelty on the part of God." To relieve the subject of this dark feature, and to see its intrinsic grandeur and superlative glory, it will be necessary to contemplate it from the proper stand-point.

One difficulty on the subject arises from the improper use of the term punishment; the idea that God punished Jesus Christ instead of sinners. God does not and can not punish the innocent.

"The very idea of punishment implies the notion of guilt, or ill-desert in the person upon whom it is inflicted. It is suffering inflicted on an offender on account of his real or supposed personal guilt. Hence, as God regards all things just as they are in themselves, he can not look upon the innocent as guilty; and consequently he can not inflict punishment upon them. And when we speak of the agonies which Christ endured for us, we mean to convey the idea that he suffered these in order to release us from the punishment due to our sins."

The atonement is not an expedient contrary to law, but above law, and was introduced into the divine government as an adequate satisfaction to law and justice; fully as much so as the actual infliction of the literal penalty on the sinner would be. Let us consider this subject.

There are two kinds of justice, commercial or commutative, and legal. Commercial justice, is rendering an equivalent for an article received, a *quid pro quo*; it may be in kind, or in some other commodity. There are two sorts of equivalents, one belonging to commercial transactions, and the other to moral and civil affairs. A commercial equivalent is an exchange of one kind of property for another, as between a buyer and a seller, and which particularly defines the kind and quantity to be thus exchanged. A moral or civil equivalent does not regard kind or quantity, but secures the same ends and produces the same effects as the other moral or civil measure instead of which it is substituted.

When we say Christ died to satisfy justice, we do not mean that he endured the identical penalty of the law that was due to sinners; nor that his sufferings were equal in degree to the pains and agonies that would have been endured by the world of mankind if Christ had not died; nor that they were the same in kind that impenitent sinners endure. Remorse is one principle source of suffering of the lost. This implies consciousness of guilt. This Christ could not suffer, because he never sinned. We reject *toto cælo* the commercial view of the atonement.

Legal justice has two distinctive significations, which have been designated by the epithets retributive and administrative. By retributive justice is meant that attribute of God which inclines

him to punish an offender merely on account of the intrinsic demerit and hatefulness of his offense ; and which animadvert upon the evil conduct of a moral agent considered as an individual, and not as a member of the great family of intelligent beings. This attribute seeks to punish sin merely because it deserves punishment, and not because its punishment is necessary to secure the ends of government ; and, supposing sin to exist, it would have its object, even if there were only one accountable creature in the universe. The object of public or administrative justice is quite different. It inflicts punishment, not merely because it is deserved, but principally in order to prevent transgression, and to secure the general good, by securing the ends of wise and good government. In the moral government of God, one of the highest objects of this kind of justice is to secure in the hearts of its subjects a cordial approbation of the principles according to which they are governed. This is indispensable to the very existence of moral government.

Now, when we affirm that Christ made satisfaction to divine justice, we do not mean to say he has made satisfaction to the retributive justice of God. For this requires the punishment of the offender, and of no one else. It accepts of no substitute. And hence it is impossible to conceive that it can be satisfied except by the punishment of the offender himself. The object of this sort of justice, as before said, is personal guilt ; and hence, as our Savior did not become personally guilty, when he consented to die for us, so it is impossible to conceive that he became liable to the infliction of the retributive justice of God.

“The sinner is just as guilty after the atonement as he was before ; and he is just as obnoxious to the infliction of the retributive justice of God. He may still be most justly punished ; for as the claims of retributive justice have not been satisfied, so they may be demanded of him without being a second time exacted. He really deserves the wrath of God on account of his sins, although administrative justice has been satisfied ; and, hence, when he complies with the terms of remission, all his sins are freely and graciously pardoned. No satisfaction is made to retributive justice. It is the administrative justice of God that has

been satisfied by the atonement. As this merely enforces the punishment of the sinner in order to secure the ends of good government, it is capable of yielding and giving place to any expedient by which those ends may be secured. In other words, it is capable of being satisfied by whatever method God may be pleased to adopt in order to secure the ends of good government, and to accomplish his own glorious designs, without the punishment of the sinner. All this has been most gloriously accomplished by the death of Christ. God can now be just, and yet the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus. The grand obstacles which the administrative justice of God interposed to the forgiveness of sin, having been taken out of the way and nailed to the cross, that unbounded mercy from which the provision of such a Savior proceeded can now flow down upon a "lost and ruined world in all the fullness and plenitude of its pardoning and sanctifying power."

XIII.

Such was the mercy of God, that he could not leave his poor fallen creatures to endure the penalty of the law without giving them an opportunity of avoiding it under a probationary trial; and such, on the other hand, was his regard for the purity and happiness of the intelligent universe, that he could not permit his law to be violated with impunity. If his administrative justice had not stood in the way, the offer of pardon to the sinner would have cost him merely a word. And hence the length, the breadth, and the depth of his love could not have been manifested. But he was the Ruler of the universe, and as such his law stood in the way. He owed it to himself not to permit this to be trampled under foot with impunity, nor its violation to be forgiven until he had provided some way to secure the high and holy ends for which it had been established. Hence, as it was not possible for God to deny himself, he sent forth his beloved Son, who had been the companion of his bosom and his blessedness from all eternity, to take upon himself the form of a servant, and by his teaching, and obedience, and sufferings, and death, to vindicate the majesty of the law, and to render it honorable in the sight of the universe.

And it is this wonderful union of the goodness and severity, of the mercy and the justice of God, which constitutes the grand moral tendency and glory of the cross.

The course pursued by the king of the Locrians, in relation to the crime of his son, secured the ends of the law in a much greater degree than they could have been secured by a vigorous execution of its penalty upon the person of his son. It evinced a deep and settled abhorrence of the crime, and an inflexible determination to punish it. It cut off all hope from his subjects that crime would be suffered to escape with impunity. And hence, after such a manifestation of his character as a king, he could permit his son to enjoy the unspeakable blessings of sight, without holding out the least encouragement to the commission of crime.

So, likewise, in relation to the sufferings of Christ. These were not, in strictness, the penalty of the law. This was eternal death; whereas, the sufferings of Christ, inconceivably great as they were, were but temporal; and there can be no proportion between sufferings which know a period, and those which are without end. Hence, as we have before said, Christ did not satisfy the punitive justice of God. But his sacrifice answered all the purposes that could have been answered by the most rigorous execution of the law; and it answered them in an infinitely greater degree than if the human race had been suffered to endure the penalty without remedy.

Since God has given for us his beloved Son while we were yet enemies, we are most firmly persuaded that he will freely give us all things that can possibly conduce to our good. Surely, after such a display of his love, it were highly criminal in us to permit the least shadow of suspicion or distrust to intercept the sweet and cheering and purifying beams of his reconciling countenance. Whatever may be his severity against sin, and whatever terror it may strike into the countenance of evil-doers, we can most cordially acquiesce in its justness; for we most clearly perceive that the penalty of the law was not established to gratify any private appetite for revenge, but to uphold and secure the highest happiness of the moral universe." The death of Christ, then, was a demonstration of the justice and goodness of God in the forgive-

ness of sin. To unite mercy and justice in forgiving the sinner was the supreme end in God's sparing not his own Son.

XIV.

CHRIST DIED IN THE ROOM OR STEAD OF SINNERS.

That the pardon of our sins and our entire salvation is ascribed to the death of Christ is an idea that strikes the mind of every attentive reader of the New Testament, as a fact which will not be questioned. Our salvation is especially and emphatically connected with that wonderful event. "I lay down my life for the sheep." "He gave himself for us." "He died the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us." "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our sins." "We who were afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood." The Son of God came "to give his life a ransom for many." "Christ died for us." "Who his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree." "Much more being justified by his blood." "We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son ;" with innumerable other passages in which, with equal emphasis, the salvation of man is connected with the death of Christ. Now what can be the meaning of these and such like passages, except that he died in our stead ? That this is their meaning, we proceed now to prove. The Scriptures teach us that "he died the just for the unjust." He suffered for us. He died for all. He tasted death for every man. He died for the ungodly. He gave himself a ransom for all, and such like.

The Greek prepositions translated *for* in the above passages, though they do not always, yet they do frequently, mean instead of. This can not be questioned. Take some examples. "It is expedient that one man should die (*hyper*) for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." Here plainly the meaning is that either Christ or the nation must perish ; and that by putting the former to death, he would die instead of the nation. In Rom. v., 6-8, the sense in which Christ "died for us" is indisputably fixed by the context : "For scarcely for a righteous man will

one die, yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die ; but God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died (*hyper*) for us." In this sense is *anti* also used by the Seventy, 2 Sam. xviii., 33, where David says concerning Absalom : " Would to God I had died for thee." He could have meant nothing else but to wish he had died instead of Absalom. In the sense of " in the room or stead of," *anti* is used also in the New Testament ; as, " Archelaus did reign in Judæa (*anti*) in the room of his father Herod." " If his son ask a fish, will he (*anti*) for a fish (instead of a fish) give him a serpent ?" When, therefore, the same preposition is used in Mark x., 45, " The Son of man came to give his life a ransom (*anti*) for many," it certainly has the same meaning—in the room or stead of.

Under the law, the blood of the slain animal, which was its life, was substituted for the life of the offender. This was typical of the blood of Christ, which made atonement for sinners ; " which was shed (*peri*) for many in order to the remission of sins."

While the blood or death of Christ was for us, in the sense of in our room or stead, when considered in respect to God, it was designed to expiate sin.

To expiate means " to atone for, to make atonement for." God said to Moses : " You shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, who is guilty of death ; but he shall be surely put to death." " The land can not be cleansed (expiated) of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." (Num. xxxv., 33.) " When he (Christ) had expiated our sins," or made expiation for them. (Macknight.) " Now once in the end of the ages has he appeared to expiate sin." " Who his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree" (1 Peter ii., 24), where the apostle evidently quotes from Isaiah liii. : " He shall bear their iniquities ;" " He bore the sins of many." The same expression is used by the apostle Paul (Heb. ix., 28) : " So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Similar to this expression of bearing sins is the declaration of Isaiah in the same chapter : " He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities ;" and then to show in what sense he was wounded and bruised for our trans-

gressions, he adds: "The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed." "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all; he was oppressed and he was afflicted." In 2 Cor. v., 21, the apostle Paul uses almost the same language: "For he hath made him to be sin [a sin-offering] for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Daniel says: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon the holy city to restrain the transgression, to make an end of sin-offerings—to make a propitiation or reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness." "Sin-offerings are ended because reconciliation for iniquity is made, and a justification perfect and complete is brought in." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." "He appeared once in the end of the typical ages to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

The apostle teaches us in the most explicit manner, in his epistle to the Hebrews, that the sacrifices under the law were expiatory offerings for certain offenses against the commonwealth of Israel, and that they were also typical of the great expiatory sacrifice of Christ. "If the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of the heifer, sprinkled upon those who were defiled, made expiation in respect to eternal purity; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God."

XV.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST PROPITIATORY.

The mercy-seat under the law was the golden lid or covering of the ark of the covenant, from which were wrought two golden cherubims, between and upon which the divine Majesty was said to dwell. The golden lid, called *hilasterion*, concealed the two tables of the covenant or law spoken from Sinai. Upon and above it blood was sprinkled on the day of atonement. (Lev. xiv.) This lid or cover was the throne of grace to the Jews. God was addressed as sitting between the cherubim. On the day of atone-

ment the high-priest appeared there, and offered blood, which he sprinkled seven times before the mercy-seat. After which the Lord forgave and blessed the people. Now, as the blood of Aaron's offering so affected the mercy-seat as to cause the blessing to flow to Israel after the flesh ; so the blood of Christ, carried by himself into the true holiest of all, the archetype of the old sanctuary, so affects the throne of God in the heavens as to cause the promised blessings of the new covenant to flow to Israel according to the spirit. But as Jesus is himself the altar, the victim, and the priest, he becomes the mercy-seat only "through faith in his blood." God, says the apostle Paul, has exhibited him as a mercy-seat through faith in his blood—the solitary instance which the Bible affords of the phrase "faith in his blood." This makes him a mercy-seat to us. Without faith he is no propitiatory to any one. Blood sprinkled upon the lid and before the lid, made that lid a mercy-seat ; and to no other worshiper was it a mercy-seat, but to him whose faith in the call, appointment, and acceptability of the Jewish high-priest and his service brought him to his knees."—A. C. It is faith in Christ's blood that makes him to any person a mercy-seat.

To propitiate, says Webster, is "to conciliate ; to appease one offended and render him favorable." In the case before us, the person making the propitiation is Christ ; the propitiating offering or sacrifice is his blood. All this is expressed in most explicit terms in the following passages : "And he is the propitiation for our sins." "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Whom God hath set forth a propitiation in his blood."

There is a sense, then, in which God is propitiated, pacified, and even reconciled to us.—A. C. See a notable instance of this, Ezek. xvi., 63 : "When I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done." "Many a time turned he his anger away." *Heilamos*, in the sense of propitiation, conciliation, occurs in the following passages in the Septuagint and in the Apocrypha : "He shall offer his sin-offering (*hilasmon*), saith the Lord." "And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering." "The ram of the atonement." "Now as the high-priest was making an atonement."

(Ezek. xliv., 27 ; xiv., 19 ; Num. v., 8 ; 2 Macca. iii., 33.) It is the blood to which is ascribed the power of propitiation. "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." "Without shedding of blood is no remission."

To sum up the whole of this subject, we may say that the sacrificial blood is the atonement, or that which makes atonement. This is a grand cause from which proceed many effects, the principal of which are : "Propitiation, as respects God ; expiation, as respects sin ; reconciliation, as respects the human heart ; justification, as respects guilt, or the consciousness of sin ; sanctification, as respects his pollution ; and redemption, as respects his actual personal deliverance from sin and all its consequences."—A.C.

The atonement of Jesus Christ did not excite in the bosom of the divine Father the feeling of benevolence and compassion toward the apostate human race, and thus incline him to the exercise of mercy. It propitiated God in no other sense than as it opened a just and honorable way for his grace to be exercised, or as it gave him a justifiable reason to be propitious. No intelligent Christian supposes that God was irreconcilable, cruel, full of vengeance, and inimical to fallen man ; and that his Son, our Lord, was more compassionate and more merciful, and died to placate his ire, and to quench the fire of his wrath in his own heart's blood. God was as much disposed and inclined to grace and mercy without an atonement as with it, provided they could be expressed with honor to the government, and with safety to the public good. Grace and mercy are, as well as justice and truth, attributes essential to the nature and character of God. Hence the Scriptures represent the atonement as the means of expressing, not the cause of exciting, the exercise of any divine perfection. God gave his Son to be an atonement because he loved the world ; and redemption is through the blood of his Son according to the riches of his grace. The atonement is never represented in the Scriptures as changing or modifying the nature of any divine attribute. When a change is produced in the aspect of the divine administration, *i. e.*, when God is said to be propitiated through the atonement, it is not meant that the atonement made him propitious, or rendered him favorable and kind ; but that the atone-

ment was the ground on which he declared himself propitious, and the medium through which he expressed himself gracious. The actual change is in the state of the sinner. The atonement places him on a favorable ground where the divine administrations may have a favorable aspect on him. And be it observed, that until the sinner personally avails himself of the provisions of the atonement, and in his own behalf, God will not express himself propitiated toward him. God was, indeed, reconcilable and propitious to the three friends of Job, yet he would not express himself propitious, and declare himself reconciled, until they had offered their sacrifices. Then, after a change in them, there was a change in the aspect of the divine dispensations toward them. Their sacrifices produced no change in God, but they are expressive of a change in their moral relations toward him. Just so is the act of the sinner in submitting to the words of the gospel, he thus pleads the atonement of Christ in his personal behalf; his act of faith is expressive of a change in his moral relations toward God.

Thus far we have treated of the effects of the atonement Godward, *i. e.*, we have shown the influences of the death of Christ as an expedient introduced into the divine moral government as it relates to God and his law; and we have seen that the death of Jesus the Christ expiated sin, propitiated the divine Father, and satisfied law and justice in a sense that God can now be just in justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ.

XVI.

THE INFLUENCES OF THE ATONEMENT ON MAN.

We come now to consider the atonement manward, *i. e.*, to contemplate the effects it is adapted to produce upon the sinner, and the effects it must produce upon him, in order that he may be benefited by the provisions made for him in the atonement.

The first effect of the atonement of Christ upon man of which we shall speak is reconciliation—our reconciliation to God. “For it pleased the Father that in him all fullness should dwell; and having made peace through the blood of the cross, by him to reconcile all things to himself; by him, I say, whether they be

things on earth or things in heaven ; and you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death." (Col. i., 19-22.) "For when we were sinners we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son ; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation." (Rom. v., 10, 11.) "All things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." (2 Cor. v., 18, 19.) The verb *katallasso*, translated to reconcile, signifies to change a person toward another from enmity to friendship ; to reconcile to any one, and thus differs from *diallasso*, which implies mutual change. Robinson, *apokatallasso*, to reconcile fully.

The expressions "reconciliation," and "making peace," necessarily suppose a previous state of enmity ; and this the apostle asserts : "And you were enemies in your mind by wicked works." "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." "And that he might reconcile both Jews and Gentiles unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (Eph. ii., 16.)

From the above passages we learn that we were enemies to God, being alienated in our mind. This makes our reconciliation necessary, in order to peace with God. We had gone away from God and had become his enemies without cause. The breach was made by us ; we had done the wrong. Yet God has provided the means of our reconciliation to him. The means of this reconciliation is the death of Christ. "We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son." It is this which destroys the enmity of the human heart. This is God's means of reconciling the world to himself. Hence the ministry or word of reconciliation which God committed to the apostles is, that "God is in Christ reconciling the world to himself." The recorded fact that Jesus died for us is "the word of reconciliation."

JUSTIFICATION.

Another benefit accruing to man through the atonement of Christ is justification, or remission of sins. The Scriptures uniformly

ascribe remission of sins, or justification, to the death or blood of Christ, as the procuring cause. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." (Rom. iii., 24.) "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi., 28.) "Much more then, being justified by his blood." (Rom. v., 9.) "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." (Eph. i., 7.)

Whatever may be the relation of other things—as the love and grace of God, baptism, etc., to the actual remission of sins, the blood of Christ is confessedly the only procuring cause of remission. To the blood or death of Christ the Scriptures uniformly ascribe justification as the cause by which it is procured. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." It is God that justifies the sinner; but he justifies him because Christ died. The death of Christ justifies God in justifying the sinner who is of the faith of Jesus. It is the blood of Christ that gives efficacy to any and every thing else as means of justification. Is an active faith a means of justification? It is such only because Christ died, and because it is faith in his blood. But that Christ died, faith would not have been accepted of the sinner instead of that perfect and perpetual obedience which he had failed to render to the good, holy, and just law of God. In other words, but for the death of Christ, faith would not, could not, be imputed to the sinner for righteousness. The faith that leads to justification is faith in the blood of Christ. Is repentance a means of justification or remission? It is so because Christ died that a dispensation of repentance might be granted to sinners. "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke xxiv., 46, 47.) Repentance toward God is preached in connection with faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, *i. e.*, in connection with faith in the blood of Christ. Is faith, as put forth toward Christ in the overt act of baptism, preached for remission of sins? It is because this faith terminates upon the blood of Christ, and because this faith expects to reach the efficacy of this blood through this heaven-appointed channel.

It is only because baptism is the overt act of faith that it is for remission of sins. Baptism is not for remission in the same sense that the blood of Christ is for remission. The latter is the procuring cause, and the latter is the medium through which faith reaches the efficacy of the blood of atonement. In no other sense than as the overt act of faith is baptism in order to remission of sins.

PURIFICATION

is another benefit brought to sinners by virtue of the death of Christ. Sin not only incurs guilt ; it also produces pollution, or defilement. "To them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure ; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." (Titus i., 15.) The blood of Christ cleanses, purifies, washes, the soul from all the polluting and defiling influences of sin. "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John i., 7.) "How much more shall the blood of Jesus Christ purge your conscience from dead works." (Heb. ix., 14.) "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." (Heb. xiii., 12.) "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." It is "the blood of the covenant by which we are sanctified." (Heb. x., 29.)

REDEMPTION.

Another effect of the blood of Christ is to redeem man from sin and all its consequences. The terms redeemed, bought, purchased, ransomed, and others of the same class, are employed in the Scriptures to express the work of Christ in achieving our salvation. "Having justified us freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." "In whom we have redemption through his blood." "You were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain behavior or course of life." "You are not your own, for you are bought with a price." (Rom. iii., 24 ; Gal. iii., 13 ; Eph. i., 7 ; 1 Peter i., 18, 19 ; 1 Cor. vi., 19, 20.) "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." "Who gave himself a ransom for us." "Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity." "Thou hast redeemed

us to God by thy blood." (Matt. xx., 28 ; 1 Tim. ii., 6 ; Rev. v., 9.) "Feed the church of the Lord, which he has purchased with his own blood." (Acts xx., 28.)

Redemption signifies not merely the liberation of captives, but deliverance from exile, death, and every other evil from which we may be freed ; and *lutron* signifies everything which satisfies another, so as to effect this deliverance. The nature of this redemption is to be ascertained by the circumstances of those who are the subjects of the purchase. The subjects in the case before us are sinful men. They are under guilt, the servants of sin, under sentence of death, and liable to eternal punishment. To the whole of this case, the redemption, the purchased deliverance of man as proclaimed in the gospel, applies itself. Hence, in the above cited passages, it is said, "we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," in opposition to guilt ; deliverance from death by the resurrection ; and from the wrath to come, by "the gift of eternal life." Throughout the whole of this glorious scheme of our redemption from these tremendous evils, there is in the New Testament a constant reference to the *lutron*, the redemption price, which is declared to be the death of Christ. The deliverance of man from sin and misery, and other evils consequent upon our transgressions, was effected by the ransom price, the precious blood of Christ.

Christ, by his death, has redeemed us to God. The atonement is the essential cause of our redemption and deliverance from sin. The apostle Paul says that Christ by his own blood has "obtained eternal redemption."

Of what transcendent worth is the atonement—the death—the blood of Christ ! and what stupendous consequences hang upon that single event !

XVII.

THE EFFICACY OF THE ATONEMENT RETROSPECTIVE.

"For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and of the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh ; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience

from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by reason of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Heb. ix., 13-15.) "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." (Heb. x., 11.)

Taking the above statements of the apostle as our basis, we lay down the following propositions :

1. "The life and death, the blessings and the curse of the law of Moses, were merely fleshly and temporal, and therefore the efficacy of its sacrifices could extend no further than to temporal life and temporal blessings. When, therefore, a Jew had forfeited these, the sacrificial law had no blessings in store for him. (Deut. xxviii., 1-68.)

2. "But until a man had forfeited these, the legal sacrifices accompanied with repentance, and the previous qualifications had efficacy to secure remission of all the penalties of that institution. (Lev. vi., 1-7 ; xv., 31 ; Num. xix., 13.)

3. "Salvation under the law, spiritual and eternal, was through faith, repentance, and sacrifice, as it was from Adam to Moses.

4. "No transgression or sin, even that of ignorance, or of mere ceremonial defilement, however trifling, could without sacrifice be forgiven. No repentance or amendment of life, without shedding of blood, could obtain remission."—A. C.

5. Remission of sins under the law, by means of the blood of animal sacrifices, was remission of sins as committed against the commonwealth of Israel ; but as sins against God, they were only passed by through the forbearance of God, not remitted ; and no sin against God ever was or can be remitted save through the blood of Christ.

6. All sacrifices, whether before or under the law, were typical of the great sacrifice of Jesus, the Messiah.

The sins expiated or atoned for by the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of the heifer, were political sins, *i. e.*, transgressions against the law as a political institution—sins against the commonwealth of Israel ; but as sins against God, they were atoned for by the blood of Christ. Paul tells us that Christ's death

atoned for "two chapters of sins"—those "passed by" before Christ died—during the forbearance of God ; and sins committed since his death. The "called" under the former dispensation,—those who under law obeyed God—were pardoned during the forbearance of God, while as yet there was no "redemption," no true and full deliverance from the guilt of sin ; and those who are now "the called," who obey the gospel, are pardoned through the same redemption. The atonement of Christ is equally efficacious prospectively and retrospectively. And if there is efficacy in the blood of atonement to cleanse the heart and purify the conscience of those now living, it is equally efficacious for the redemption of the transgressions that under the first covenant were "passed by during the forbearance of God." The word translated "passed," in Rom. iii., 25 (sins that are passed through the forbearance of God,) Robinson says, means pre-termitted, remitted in the sense of being overlooked, not punished ; and differs from *aphesis*, which implies pardon, forgiveness. A similar expression is found in Micah vii., 18 : "Who is a God like to thee, who pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of thine heritage?" To pass by iniquity is not to punish it. Thus the sins of the ancient saints, from Abel to the death of Messiah, were passed by till expiated by the redemption that was in the blood of Christ. Hence the atonement of Christ is represented as buying off the punishment due for the sins committed under the former dispensations, and as vindicating the justice of God in forgiving them. The death of Christ was for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant. He was the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," in the sacrifices that were typical of him. (Rev. xiii., 8.) And the apostle Peter says men "are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifested in these last times for you." (1 Pet. i., 20.) All, from Adam to the last sinner that shall be reclaimed, will be redeemed by the blood of Christ. Hence the unity of the song in heaven. All will sing : "To Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen."

CLEMENT.

REVIEW OF "W." ON MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

THE article on *Missionary Societies*, in the last number of the *Quarterly*, over the signature of "W.," is justly commended by the editor as one of the best, if not the very best, which has appeared on this subject. Its superior excellence consists not merely in the dignified tone and extreme thoughtfulness which pervade it, but still more in the clearness with which it develops certain points in the controversy hitherto overlooked. We propose to notice some of these, and, at the same time, point out what we consider some defects in the argument.

For the first time in the history of this controversy, so far as my memory serves, we find in "W.'s" article a formal attempt to define the rule by which we may always distinguish between things lawful and things unlawful. Such a rule is absolutely necessary to intelligent procedure in any department of religious activity, and especially so in the labyrinth of things which lie along the borders of expediency. There is nothing of more importance, in the present crisis of our religious history, than the clear elimination of this rule. It is important not merely for the settlement of the controversy on *Missionary Societies*, but for the determination of many other questions which have arisen and which may arise among us.

In pursuit of this inquiry, "W." proceeds first to examine two rules which have been virtually adopted, one by the opponents and the other by the friends of *Missionary Societies*, and very justly condemns both. He then attempts to elicit the truth by submitting and discussing the following propositions: "1. When any duty is devolved upon us in the Bible, and the mode of discharging it is prescribed therein, then the following of the given prescription is the only way to discharge the obligation. 2. When any duty is prescribed in the Bible, and the manner or plan of performing it is not given, then whatever means we may think will best accomplish the object, though human expedients, may be, nay, must be adopted." These two propositions are intended as a

statement of the rule for which we are searching, and then, in order to test by this rule the claims of Missionary Societies, two other propositions are added : "3. The duty, which rests somewhere, is the preaching of the gospel. 4. The duty of preaching the gospel, and therefore of converting sinners, is, by the appointment of God, laid on the church."

In considering the merits of these propositions, we will take up the last first. Is it true that "the duty of preaching the gospel is, by the appointment of God, laid on the church?" The writer attempts to prove it by sundry quotations from the prophets and the apostles, but his proof comes short of the proposition. In the nature of the case it is impossible for a church to preach the gospel. In the secondary sense, of illustrating the gospel by example, it certainly can ; but in the primary sense of the term preach, it can not. The church may cause the gospel to be preached ; it may furnish food and raiment for the preacher, but it can not preach. It is not true, then, that the duty of preaching the gospel has been laid on the church ; it is not so stated in the passages quoted, nor is it consistent with the nature of the case.

The truth is, that the duty of preaching the gospel is laid, not on the church, but on certain members of the church. In one way of preaching, it is the duty of every member to preach. This "*W*." very earnestly and correctly insists upon. But the preaching which is done by example, by private admonition and exhortation, and in all the private ways in which an earnest disciple is always making known the truth, is not the preaching about which we speak when we discuss the question of Missionary Societies. It is the public and formal proclamation of the word of God ; and to this the term is appropriated in the Scriptures. Now, it is clear to a Bible reader that this is enjoined not on the church, nor on every member of the church. Women are forbidden to take part in it, and only those are called to do it to whom God has given the natural and acquired ability. In the first instance, Jesus commanded, not his disciples as a body, nor all the individuals who were his disciples, but twelve men, specially chosen and qualified for the work, to go and preach. He afterward sent seventy others, in couples, to traverse a certain field and preach

the coming kingdom. When, at a later period still, the twelve were regulating the work of the disciples, they did not require all the members to preach, but a class of persons called preachers was perpetuated in the church, and the ordinance established that "they who preach the gospel shall live by the gospel," *i. e.*, they who preach shall be supported by those who do not preach.

We will not pause here to discuss the question how men passed into this class, save to remark that some were called to preach by the church, some by other preachers, and some were moved to it by their own sense of duty. In other words, every man was taught to exercise whatever gift God had bestowed on him. He who had the ability to preach must preach, and by preaching he became a preacher.

So far as the article we are reviewing contains an argument against Missionary Societies, it is based upon the proposition just disposed of. By means of it "W." argues, with great plausibility, that the friend of societies must prove either, "first, that the societies are the church; or, second, that God has commissioned them as his agents, distinct from the church, to have the gospel preached; or, third, that the church has authority from God for transferring the responsibility, in whole or in part, to these societies, and that it has done it." I think it can be clearly shown that the friend of the societies is not limited to these three alternatives; for it might be that the churches are authorized to employ the societies as their own agents, through whom they perform the work assigned them. This would not make the societies the church, nor a divinely commissioned body distinct from the church, nor a body to whom the church's work is transferred; but simply a medium through which the church performs her own work. But it is unnecessary to argue this, seeing that the duty of preaching is assigned not to the church, but only to such members of the church as are by nature and grace and opportunity qualified to preach.

The error which we have now pointed out in "W.'s" fourth proposition is the natural result of that which characterizes his third proposition. He was preparing the way for the fourth, when he stated as the third: "The duty, which rests somewhere,

is the preaching of the gospel." I submit that, as a statement of the duty involved in this discussion, this proposition misses the mark entirely. The work attempted through Missionary Societies, and the work referred to when we ask whether Missionary Societies should be employed, is not the work of preaching. This is done by preachers, and not by societies or by churches. The work under discussion is that of sustaining preachers in certain places, so that in those places they may preach. Missionary Societies are organized for the purpose of collecting and disbursing money to sustain preachers who agree to labor in destitute places. This is the work which they have chiefly attempted, and the only work which it is claimed that they have a right to perform. This, too, is the work which is assigned by God to the churches. It is the duty of churches, in their corporate capacity, as appears from many passages in Acts and the epistles, to perform this work; and yet the members, in their individual capacity, may take part in it. (See Acts xv., 3; 1 Cor. xi., 8, 9; Rom. xvi., 2; 3 John 6, etc.)

One grand mistake of "W.," then, and the chief mistake of his article, consists in the failure to distribute the work in question. Instead of only one, we have two great duties involved; the duty of preaching the gospel, which devolves on those who can preach; and the duty of sustaining the preachers, which devolves on the churches. With this distribution of the subject, it is easy to see the position and work of Missionary Societies. The churches, or such individual members of the churches as see fit to do so, deliver money to the officers of these societies, authorizing them to expend it in supporting preachers who labor in certain fields. This is the true theory of a Missionary Society. It is the theory, more or less clearly understood, which the advocates of the societies among us have approved, and which they have more or less efficiently reduced to practice. Effectively reduced to practice, it must satisfy them all. The machinery necessary to this is all they can ask; and if they have devised too much, they must be ready to lop off every superfluous part.

But how shall we know that these things are right? How shall we know, in the first place, whether the churches have a

right to throw together their contributions for the support of preachers, into the hands of any common agency? And how shall we know, in the second place, what agencies to employ for this purpose? We can not settle these questions without some fixed rule, such as "*W.*" seeks to eliminate. What shall that rule be? We can not move one step without it, unless we move in the dark.

The first two propositions of "*W.*" constitute a very creditable attempt at establishing this rule; but I have two objections to them. First, as a rule, they are too complicated. A rule, to be a good one, must be as simple as possible, and as brief as possible. Second, the latter of the two propositions allows too much liberty. "When any duty is prescribed in the Bible, and the manner or plan of performing is not given," it is rather too free to say, "whatever means we may think will best accomplish the object must be adopted." The command to do a certain act authorizes nothing more than is necessary to the doing. If anything not necessary be done, it would be vain to plead the command as authority. I would amend the proposition, then, by saying, "whatever means are found necessary to accomplish the object must be adopted." This, I presume, is about what "*W.*" intended. Supposing now, that this is admitted, I find my mind at once reverting to an old rule, long since adopted by our fathers, and for many years very sacred among us, though of late it has become almost obsolete in some quarters. Let no man shrug his shoulders, and put on contemptuous looks, when I say that this old rule is that sententious watchword of the fathers: "A 'Thus saith the Lord' for every item of faith and practice." As a friend of Missionary Societies, and as a friend or foe, as the case may be, of everything, I am willing to be tied down to this rule. I feel absolutely safe under it, and I am afraid to trust myself to any other. Is not God our lawgiver? Has he not given us a perfect law? Then who dare say there is any duty which he has omitted to enjoin, or any sin which he has not forbidden? The man who has full faith in the sufficiency of God's word can never be afraid of this rule.

But what is this rule, and how does it enable us to distinguish what we may do, from what we may not do? It is not that we must have every duty separately named in some command, and every possible sin individually named in some prohibition. It does not even confine us to precepts of the Scriptures. It is this: Everything we may do is to be found, either expressed or implied, in some precept or approved precedent. The record of approved precedents is as much the word of God as the record of precepts. On the other hand, everything we may not do is to be found included in some prohibition, or in some disapproved example. I think, from the tone of "W.'s" article, that he would not object to being closely bound by this rule.

We now inquire how this rule applies to the case in hand. First, it binds preachers to preach the gospel wherever God, in his providence, opens to them the ripest harvest. Included in this is everything necessary to the performance of the work; not everything pleasant or convenient, but everything necessary. It may, at times, prove very inconvenient and unpleasant to perform the work, as Paul often found it; so that things convenient and comfortable are not included in the command, while things necessary certainly are. One of these necessary things is bread. The preacher must have bread while he preaches. If there were no separate precept, then, for supplying bread, still I would have a "Thus saith the Lord" for it, in the very command to go and preach. But we have a separate "Thus saith the Lord" that preachers shall be supported, and that, too, by the churches. This brings us to the question, How shall the churches furnish this support? "W." has answered, and his answer is a good one: "The work is commanded; and surely, if the way is not marked out, it is our duty to make a way." That is well said. This is our rule. The command to do a thing includes everything necessary to the doing. Sometimes one way may be necessary, sometimes another; but always the way that is necessary to the doing, and to doing the very best that can be done, is enjoined, and a "Thus saith the Lord" enjoins it. If, then, a Missionary Society is necessary to the most effective support of preachers in destitute places, it is commanded in the command to support

such preachers. This "W." virtually concedes when he reaches his final conclusion ; for he concludes that "messengers sent by half a dozen, or half a dozen thousand churches to Cincinnati," may appoint a chairman, secretary, treasurer, etc., for themselves, unite the sums of money which they have brought together, for the support of preachers, and appoint another day to meet again for the same purpose. Our rule requires all this, if it be found necessary, or even more than this ; but still, only what is necessary to the proposed work. I suppose, too, that if "W." should find, when his messengers were assembled, some disciples present who were not messengers, he would not refuse them also the privilege of contributing to the common fund. Whether he would or not, our rule would require them to offer their contributions ; for we have a "Thus saith the Lord," that "To him who knows to do good, and does it not, to him it is sin."

All the machinery, then, that shall be found necessary in order that churches may work together in sending the gospel through the whole world, is authorized by that simple rule which was the boast and the strength of the Reformation in its early days. But not one single device, or law, or office, which effective work does not require, will it allow us to employ. The work before us, therefore, is to simplify, and readjust our machinery, till not one superfluous or unnecessary part shall remain, and until even the name by which we call it shall be the simplest and most exact which the nature of the case will admit. This will satisfy every right-thinking man, and will give strength irresistible to the plea for co-operative effort. M.

It should cheer the steps of a servant of Jesus Christ, as he journeys, to know that, even in darkness, his guide is with him, and that that guide is the King of the country through which he is traveling.

NEVER give up, though you have tried many times to do good, and failed by the influence of your enemies. Keep persevering, and trust in God.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE WATER, THE BLOOD, AND THE SPIRIT.

I.

“There are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood ; and these three agree in one.”—1 JOHN v., 8.

IN that part of the word of God with which the above passage stands immediately connected, we have what may be termed a beautiful climax of thought. Beginning with the ground idea in the mind of the sacred penman, we have the statement, that “he who believes that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.” Such a person, exercising such a faith, has become the subject of a great spiritual change, which, consisting in a new state, new relations and enjoyments, is appropriately termed a birth. To this person, begotten of God and born again, a divine impulse is said to be imparted, by which it is affirmed that he obtains the victory over the world. Again : by a metonymy of the cause for the effect, faith is called this victory ; from which we learn that faith, from the Bible stand-point, is a living energy in the soul, which to the child of God becomes the pledge of conquest over evil principles within, and the shield against the assaults of the world without. But as the value and power of faith are derived, not from any peculiar manner of believing, but from the truth believed, the writer is next led to state the great fundamental truth which gives to faith all its efficacy and vitality. This faith is not belief in general or in the abstract, but in the particular and supernatural proposition that Jesus is the Son of God. But a proposition, if not axiomatic, in order to the assent of the mind and the cordial embrace of the heart, must be sustained by proof, not only homogeneous, but also sufficient in quantity. Hence, as the last step in this regular sequence of thought, we have in the quotation heading this essay three most reliable and trustworthy witnesses,—“the water, the blood, and the Spirit”—which are said to agree in one ; that is, the witnesses do not contradict each other, but unite in bearing testimony to the truth of one and the

same proposition. The focal point to which the testimony of the three witnesses is directed, is the proposition that Jesus is the Son of God. The single object of this essay shall be to ascertain how these three witnesses bear their united testimony to the divine sonship of Jesus. In this investigation we shall make no reference to the three witnesses which are said to bear record in heaven, because it has been decided by the highest authorities in biblical criticism that there is here an interpolation.

We would state, as preliminary to the investigation before us, that the proof must be homogeneous with the proposition to be proved. Mathematical, moral, and supernatural propositions demand respectively mathematical, moral, and supernatural proof. Hence, since the proposition that Jesus is the Son of God belongs to the regions of the supernatural, lying as high as the heavens above the discoveries of flesh and blood, it follows that the proof in its support must also, in some way, be supernatural in its character. This principle must be the clue to guide us to the truth in this investigation. We must remember that it is only by being associated with the miraculous element that water, blood, and Spirit can be exalted into witnesses to prove the divinity of Christ. This being true, it follows that the truth of Christ's divine sonship, and the proof sustaining it, have both come from the same source. God has both revealed this truth and also furnished the witnesses to prove it. Hence we are told that the united testimony of the three witnesses is "the witness of God, which he has testified concerning his Son." That the testimony of those witnesses may have a cumulative force in the mind of the reader, we will hear them separately.

II.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE WATER.

1. We would, then, ask how does water bear witness to the truth that Jesus is the Son of God? It has been supposed that allusion is made to the water which issued from the wounded side of Christ when pierced by the spear of the Roman soldier. But remembering our guiding principle, we would ask, how could the ordinary event of the issuing of water from the pierced side of

Christ prove the extraordinary and supernatural truth of his divinity? There would be in this case no homogeneousness between the proposition and the proof. It is clear that the simple element of water in itself considered, has no voice to testify for Jesus. "The cataracts blow their silver trumpets from the steep," but they tell us naught of Jesus; "Niagara, clad in liquid robes of terror and beauty," proclaims with its voice of many waters the power and glory of the Creator, but it whispers not the name of a Redeemer. The waters of the globe, as they fall from the clouds and flow in the rivers and ebb in the ocean, proclaim in reason's ear the wisdom and the goodness of God who has spread out his firmament in the heavens and divided the waters from the waters, but they have no language nor speech to tell us aught of the Son of God. The water which speaks for Jesus belongs to a higher sphere than that which falls from the clouds of heaven. It is evident that it is only by divine appointment that water can become witness for Jesus. But the only divine appointment made of water in Christianity, and where alone it is associated with miracle, is baptism. We are, therefore, directed at once, to this divine ordinance, and ask, how does baptism bear witness to the proposition that Jesus is the Son of God? This question directs us to the baptism of John. What the morning star is to the rising sun, was John the Baptist to Christ. He came as "a burning and shining light" in "the spirit and power of Elias," with the special work before him of preparing the way for the inauguration of Christ and his entrance into public life, by gathering together the Jewish people and baptizing them upon confession of sin, in order to their reformation of life. Accordingly, John makes his appearance as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness;" the law and the prophets cease to divine; and the people, aroused and attracted by the voice of the living preacher, assemble on the banks of the Jordan and receive water baptism at his hands. This was the fullness of time whose convulsive throes were destined to shake to pieces the effete system of Judaism, and to give birth to a new order of things. John's baptism was not only designed to put men into a right relation to the past, but also to point them to the future,—to "Him who should come after him."

"And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." After the people had been assembled together by the preaching of John, Jesus also presented himself, and demanded baptism, saying: "Thus it becomes us to fulfill all righteousness." By this baptism, associated with its attending miraculous phenomena, Jesus was clearly and certainly made known to John and the surrounding multitude as the Son of God. The heavens were opened, the divine Spirit descended in visible form, and abode upon him, and the voice of God which spake to Moses from out "the blackness and darkness" of Sinai, now speaks from out "the excellent glory," saying: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." It is said Christ came by water. Baptism was the divinely appointed gate, over-arched by the opening heavens, and illuminated with celestial light, through which the Son of Mary passed when he left his humble home in Galilee and entered upon public life as the Prophet, Priest, and King of the Jewish people.

We should not omit to also associate with the baptism of Christ the miraculous element furnished in the testimony of John: "The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe." Since John was a prophet sent of God, his testimony blends itself with the miraculous phenomena connected with the baptism of Christ, and thereby greatly augments the proof in support of his divine sonship. Previous to his baptism, Jesus was known to John as a sinless and supernatural personage who needed not the baptism of repentance; but when honored by the miraculous attestations attending him on the banks of the Jordan, his high and peculiar relation to the Father was then clearly made known to John: "And I saw and bear record that this is the Son of God."

III.

2. We come now to notice the relation sustained to the divine sonship of Christ by his baptism when viewed from another standpoint. He was to be a model for the imitation of his people. On the divine side of his nature he was the image of the invisible

God, and higher than the heavens; on the human side he comes into loving sympathy with the fallen race of Adam, taking upon himself its low estate, touching humanity at every point, and in turn tempted at every point, yet without sin. Having sounded all the depths of humanity, knowing it experimentally in all its sufferings and griefs, Christ becomes to his people, in all respects, a perfect model which they are to follow and imitate. This holy alliance formed by the Son of God with humanity, this complete oneness between him and his people, is the thought in the mind of Paul in Hebrews, when he says: "Both he that sanctifies and they who are sanctified are all of one;" and again: "In all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God." God has made Christ one with his people in nature, one with them in obedience, relationship, temptation, and suffering, and one with them in final glory and exaltation. But it had been determined in the counsels of divine wisdom that all the children of God in the kingdom of heaven, now about to be established on earth, were to be born of water and the Spirit. This being a fixed and unchangeable principle in the heavenly kingdom, it follows that no one can now justly wear the high and distinguished title of son of God without passing through this birth of water and the Spirit. Hence it was especially necessary that Jesus, who, by way of pre-eminence, is *the* Son of God, and the elder brother of the spiritual family of God on earth, should be born of water and the Spirit. But what is it to be thus born? When a man has become a penitent believer from a change of heart wrought by the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of the word, and is baptized, he is then born of water and the Spirit. In the case of the fallen sons of Adam this divine life is a regeneration; in the case of Jesus it was a generation derived immediately from the fountain of all being, produced by the miraculous power of the Spirit. The angel, announcing to Mary the miraculous conception of our high-born kinsman, said: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also the holy progeny born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Hence, before Christ was baptized

he had been begotten by the Spirit in the womb of the virgin, but not yet born of water. He was, therefore, in the same position as an unbaptized believer who has been begotten by the Spirit, or regenerated, but who has not yet come to his time of birth out of water. We have now arrived at a point of view from which we can see the divine philosophy of Christ's submitting to baptism. He had been begotten by the Spirit, but born of a woman, so that his birth was partly spiritual and partly fleshly. During his minority he remained subject to an earthly parentage, being known as the son of Joseph and Mary. But all the sons of God, in the new order of things now about to be established, were not only to be begotten by the Spirit, but also to be born of water, so that in the case of Christ the conditions of divine sonship had, previous to his baptism, only been partially complied with. In order, therefore, that Jesus might present to his people a perfect model for their obedience, and be one with them in relationship, it was necessary that he should be born of water, or baptized, as well as begotten by the Spirit. At his baptism, the earthly and the fleshly in the history of Christ was merged and lost from view in the birth of water, while the supernatural, the heavenly, and the divine in his nature emerged therefrom, and stood forth in bold relief. Previous to his baptism we contemplate Jesus as the son of Joseph, the carpenter; but when he emerges from the baptismal waters, the radiance and glory of signs and miracles gather around him, and we then behold him as the Son of God, and the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world.

The baptism which Christ received at the hands of John could not be for the remission of sins, as in the case of all others who received it, for he had no sins to be forgiven. The one grand feature which Christ's baptism possesses in common with that of all his people, so far as its nature and design are concerned, consists in its being a birth. Baptism, being a birth both to Christ and to his people, bears witness both to his and to their divine sonship, it being to them a pledge and proof of their adoption into the family of God. Again: the baptism administered by John to Christ could not be the baptism of repentance, as it was when administered to all others, but it was the baptism of righteous-

ness; in other words, the baptism by which his righteousness, in claiming to be the Messiah and Son of God, was clearly manifested to the surrounding multitude. From our present point of view we are enabled to see the propriety in God's withholding his public recognition of Jesus as his Son till he had been born of water. Not till thus publicly and formally acknowledged and accredited as the beloved of the Father, and anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power, did he enter upon his divine mission as the Prophet, going "about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil."

IV.

3. There is still another important aspect in which the baptism of Christ may be viewed as bearing witness to his divine mission. Having seen that it was necessary for Christ to be born of water, that he might be constituted the model Son and type of all that were to follow, we now come to consider the testimony furnished in his baptism to his divine mission, in the fact of its being essential to the complete filling up of the correspondence between him and Moses, who sustain to each other the relation of type and antitype. Moses, toward the close of his earthly career, said to Israel: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me." This great prophet is Christ, who, by virtue of a similarity of work and relationship, finds an illustrious type in the person of Moses. As Moses, in fulfillment of his divine mission, became the deliverer of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, sustaining to them the relation of leader, prophet, and lawgiver, so does Christ now sustain a similar relation to his people, delivering them from the slavery of sin and death. But the grand culmination of those mighty miracles which God wrought through Moses in effecting the deliverance of the Israelites, was their baptism in the Red Sea. Paul, in 1 Cor. x., tells us that at the time God wrought this great miracle, the Israelites were "baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Now as Moses was baptized with those whom he led, so was it necessary that Christ should also pass through the waters of baptism with his people, whom he delivers from spiritual bond-

age, in order that the correspondence between the type and the antitype might be complete in all essential points. As Moses could appeal to the mighty miracles wrought on the banks of the Red Sea, in the presence of the whole Jewish nation, as a proof of his divine mission, so could Christ appeal to those divine credentials which God, before the eyes of the assembled multitude, handed him from out the opening heavens at the time of his baptism.

V.

4. It will serve to give us more expanded views of this interesting subject by remembering that not only Moses, but also the whole nation of Israel, viewed as a unit, appears on the sacred page as a type of Christ. "Israel," said God to Moses, "is my son, my first-born." This language, in its deepest import, points to the supernatural origin of Israel, as contra-distinguished from the other nations of the earth. Isaac, the first-born of the family, was the child of faith, the offspring of miracle; and such was also the whole family, now they had grown into a nation, since, like the burning bush of Horeb, they had been miraculously preserved while in the fiery furnace of affliction in Egypt. That same almighty Power which had been the shield of their fathers while wandering in a stranger's land, had also preserved the Israelites from being consumed in the "smoking furnace" while they groaned under the iron rod of Pharaoh. Israel, therefore, saved by the arm of Jehovah, was a typical nation—typical not only of Jesus, who, like Isaac, was the first-born of the sons of God, but also of the whole spiritual family of God, which, in the fullness of time were to be gathered out of all nations and kindreds of the earth. In order to the full development of this idea, we are called to contemplate Egypt as the symbol of spiritual darkness. The place occupied by Egypt among the symbols of sacred history is shown by the scene which passed in review before the eye of Abraham, when God made with him the covenant which conveyed to his posterity the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. It is said: "When the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell on Abram; and lo, a horror of great darkness fell upon

him." The symbolical meaning of this vision of darkness God himself explains: "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years." This servitude and affliction were experienced by Abraham's seed during their sojourn in the land of Egypt, which was to them, as symbolized to Abraham by the vision of darkness and the "smoking furnace," a place of bitter bondage and oppression. Now, as God through Moses delivered Israel from this oppressed condition, so has he also through his Son redeemed his church from the darkness and slavery of spiritual Egypt. But since Christ was not in bondage to sin, he could not be called with his church out of spiritual Egypt, as was Moses with Israel out of literal Egypt. There it would seem that the correspondence between the type and the antitype is about to fail. But God who sees all things from the beginning, is able even here to keep up this correspondence. How does he do this? He so orders it in his providence that it becomes necessary for the parents of the infant Savior to flee with him into the land of Egypt, that he might not fall a victim to the ambition of man. Accordingly, the sojourn of Christ in the land of Egypt, which to the short-sighted mind of man might have appeared as a trivial event, has, in the plans of God, a deep and divine significance. Matthew says that Christ came out of Egypt: "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, 'Out of Egypt have I called my Son.'" This language, quoted from Hosea ii., 1, when viewed in the light of its context, does not seem to have the form of a prophecy, but to refer to a past historical event, to the calling of Israel out of Egypt. The language of the prophet runs thus: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." This language, spoken by the prophet with reference to the deliverance of Israel, Matthew quotes as a prophecy, and finds its fulfillment in the coming of Christ out of Egypt. Skeptics have supposed that the evangelist has in this instance committed a blunder, and hence could not have written under the influence of the Spirit of truth. But by such caviling they only show their

ignorance of divine things. It is a well-established principle in biblical hermeneutics that language, which applies primarily to the type, may, in a spiritual and higher sense, apply to the anti-type. Now we have Moses through a mighty display of miracle, which showed that God was with him, leading Israel out of the bondage of literal Egypt, which was a most impressive type of Christ redeeming his church from the oppression and misery of spiritual Egypt. Hence the language, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," has a double application, referring when spoken by the prophet to God's Son Israel; when spoken by the evangelist, to God's Son Jesus, both of whom were called out of Egypt. Hence, in the language of the Spirit, the church is termed '*Ἡ Εκκλησία*, The Called Out, a name suggestive of the glorious deliverance which God has wrought for his people. This salvation from the slavery of sin was most magnificently typified by the deliverance of Israel when they passed through the waters of the Red Sea. Pharaoh, with his war chariots and armed host, presses on from behind; defiles of mountains, high and steep, tower upward on the right and the left; the Red Sea, deep and wide, rolls before; Israel, as thus shut in on all sides, cries to God for deliverance. Man's extremity is God's opportunity. Lo! Jehovah makes bare his mighty arm from the heavens, and a way of escape is opened up from above. When that terrible night of storm and tempest had passed away, and the glancing rays of the newly risen sun flashed over Egypt's dark sea, Israel stood on the farther shore and sang the song of deliverance, while Pharaoh and his hosts were dashed to pieces by the on-rushing waters and scattered, like sea-weed, along the surf-beaten coast:

"Like the leaves of the forest, when summer is green,
That host with their banners, at sunset were seen;
Like the leaves of the forest, when autumn hath blown,
That host, on the morrow, lay withered and strown."

When Israel crossed the Red Sea, their wavering faith in Moses was strengthened and confirmed by beholding the mighty miracle which God at that time wrought through him. As a result, we are told that "The people believed the Lord, and his ser-

vant Moses." Paul tells us that when the Israelites were enveloped in the cloud and the sea they were then "baptized into Moses;" which means, that they at that time passed out from under the dominion of Pharaoh into a state of freedom, confidently believing in Moses as their leader, deliverer, and lawgiver. Antitypical to this is the salvation from sin which believers obtain through Christ when they are baptized into him, and thereby pass out from a state of condemnation into a state of justification, when they enjoy the marvelous light and liberty of the sons of God. It is thus clearly shown from the essential correspondence between the type and the antitype that Christian baptism is for the remission of sins. As already stated, since Christ was sinless, his baptism could not be for the remission of sins; yet, in order that this correspondence between him and Moses, between Israel and the church, might be preserved in other important respects, it was necessary that he should be called out of Egypt and pass with his people through the waters of baptism. We thus learn that baptism is greatly more than a mere ordinance or ceremony. It is a monumental institution, and as such, like the Supper and the Lord's day, points with peculiar significance to Christ.

VI.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE BLOOD.

The way of Christ led him not only through water, but also through blood. He came, or was manifested, "not in water only, but in water and blood." The testimony of the blood, as the second witness, unites with and confirms that of the water in support of the proposition that Jesus is the Son of God. As there was a point in the life of Christ when his coming in water clearly proved him to be the Son of God, so there was also a period in his earthly career when this same exalted relation was proved by his passage through blood. But what blood is this in which Christ came, and which is said to bear witness for him? Since his death on the cross marks the period in his career when he came in blood, we are, at once, directed to this solemn and affecting scene as the occasion when blood deposed

as a witness for his divinity. The blood of the Lamb of God, which was shed to take away the sin of the world, also bears unimpeachable testimony to the ineffable dignity and exalted nature of the illustrious Sufferer. On this occasion the grand truth of Christ's divinity was legibly written in letters of blood, read and understood by an awe-struck universe. Hence there was not only the baptism of water, but also the baptism of blood. There are several aspects in which the blood of Christ may be viewed as bearing witness for him.

1. In the first place, Jesus cheerfully and voluntarily gave his life or blood in attestation of the truth of his divine sonship. The truth which to Christ was dear above all others, which he wrought mighty miracles to sustain, for which he lived and for which he died, was the grand truth of his divinity. All the facts of his trial and condemnation before the Jewish Sanhedrim turned upon the claims which he had put forth during his public ministry—claims infinitely loftier than any man before him had ever dared to set up. What was the testimony of Christ's own consciousness with regard to himself? He claimed to be the Son of God, and boldly challenged the whole Jewish nation to prove, if they could, that this claim was a reckless and unfounded assumption. Now, had he claimed to have been the Son of God merely in the Unitarian sense, then the Jews who believed in the divine mission and inspiration of their own prophets would have had no charge against him. But they evidently understood him as claiming to have in his veins the life, the eternal and undervived nature of God himself, in all its fullness and divinity. In setting up such a claim he made himself, as they correctly affirmed, equal with God; and had he been, as viewed by them, a mere man, then it would have been true, as they alleged, that he had by his claims involved himself in the awful crime of blasphemy. His judges failing to find the requisite number of witnesses, as required by their law, upon whose testimony they might convict him, make him turn witness, and compel him to either abjure his claims to divinity, or else swear away his own life. "I adjure thee by the living God," said the high-priest, "that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God?" Placed on this solemn oath he

was shut up to one of three courses, either to remain silent, or to renounce his claims, or to boldly avow himself the Son of the Blessed. Had he refused to have answered, his silence would not only have betrayed a wavering and mistrustful spirit, but would also have been construed by his judges into a confession of guilt. In the midst of the awe and solemnity which pervaded that august tribunal, instead of abjuring his claims or modifying them in the least, he gave them, without a sign or tremor of doubt, a bold response in the affirmative. In their judgment, as the supreme court of the Jewish nation, they pronounced him guilty of blasphemy and worthy of death. Upon this claim to divinity before the Jewish Sanhedrim was he condemned and crucified. The conclusion is, therefore, inevitable, either that Jesus was the Son of God, all he claimed to be, or else he was a most daring and reckless blasphemer; either that his pretensions were just and true, or else he died with a lie in his mouth, and gave his own blood to seal and bear witness to an awful falsehood. Christians, taking the former of these alternatives, receive the blood of Christ as a witness for his divinity; while unbelieving Jews, holding the latter, regard his blood as bearing witness to the crime of blasphemy.

2. Again: Jesus, by his death, or the shedding of his blood on the cross, was proved to be the Lamb of God, the sacrificial offering slain in type from the foundation of the world. All the rays of prophecy which had traversed the dim ages of the past find their fulfillment, their meaning, and grand focal point at the cross. In the shedding of his blood Jesus was proved to be the One to whom all the ancient prophets, by divine inspiration, bear witness. We would call attention to the testimony of Isaiah and David, who seem to have been favored with special revelations of the coming One, whose souls seem to have been illuminated more radiantly with his light and glory than the other Old Testament prophets. Who can read the prophecies of those holy men who lived during a former age, and see how every minute point is fulfilled in the death of Jesus, without saying: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can be such a miracle of prophecy as thou art except God be with him." Take

a few examples illustrative of that wonderful particularity of prophecy to which we refer : 1. Christ's silence before his accusers was foretold by Isaiah : "As a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." 2. The kind of death he should die was foretold by the Psalmist : "They pierced my hands and my feet." 3. His being crucified between two thieves was foretold by Isaiah : "He was numbered with the transgressors." 4. His thirsting on the cross was predicted by David : "They gave me also gall for my meat ; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." 5. The circumstance of his legs not being broken, as was customary in the case of those who were crucified, was foretold by David : "He keepeth all his bones ; not one of them is broken." 6. The piercing of his side by the Roman spear was foretold by Zechariah : "They shall look on him whom they pierced." 7. The casting of lots for his garments was foretold by David : "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture." 8. The manner of his burial was foretold by Isaiah : "He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death."

The predictions of the ancient prophets, who "testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow," are thus characterized by the utmost minuteness of detail, in order that when the long-promised Messiah should come and make atonement for sin, and thus fulfill all the minute conditions of prophecy, the world might have the most complete demonstration of the divinity of his person and work.

3. In the third place, Jesus was proved to be the Son of God in the shedding of his blood by the supernatural displays which attended that event. When the illustrious sufferer hung on the Roman cross, strange portents in the heavens above and signs in the earth beneath proclaimed the fact that blood was then being poured out from channels in which had flowed the life of the God of nature. The sun, blazing from the mid heavens, was veiled in gloom, and "a horror of great darkness," from high noon till three o'clock in the afternoon, overspread all the land ; the earth trembled ; the hills and mountains tottered on their granite bases ; the abodes of the dead were rent asunder ; and the heavy, thickly

woven veil of the temple, without being touched by human hands, was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the penetralia of the inmost shrine of the temple were laid bare before the astonished sons of men. Even the heathen centurion, the commander of the soldiers who watched the cross, thrilled with awe when he beheld those supernatural signs and wonders, smote his breast, and exclaimed aloud : "Truly this was the Son of God."

VII.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SPIRIT.

The Spirit, as the third witness, is said to agree with the water and the blood in bearing testimony to the truth of the fundamental proposition of Christianity. "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth." We would, then, ask what miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit has God given by which Jesus is proved to be his Son?"

1. In the first place, the Spirit bore witness to Christ by descending and abiding on him at his baptism. "And I knew him not," says John, "but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me : 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.' And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." Immediately after the baptism of Christ, while yet standing on the banks of the Jordan, heaven's blue canopy seemed rent asunder, and far up through its rifted, gleaming folds, "from out the excellent glory," the Spirit descended, as a bright lambent flame, and in a hovering, dove-like motion, abode upon him, thus pointing out and identifying him as the person to whom the oracle of Jehovah applied. This splendid supernatural manifestation of the divine Spirit was the sign which God had given to John, and which he was directed to observe as the distinguishing and special characteristic of the Messiah.

2. The next miraculous manifestation of the Spirit which claims our attention, as bearing directly on the personal relations of Jesus, is the baptism of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Not only the baptism of water and the baptism of blood, but also the baptism of the Spirit bears witness in the most convincing

manner to the righteousness of Jesus in claiming to be the Son of God. The primary design of the mission of the Spirit to our world on Pentecost was to advocate the cause of Christ, to sustain his claims, and to vindicate his character against the aspersions and calumnies of his enemies, who had endeavored to fasten upon him the odium and guilt of blasphemy. Accordingly, the Savior, in his farewell address to his disciples, informs them that it was expedient for them that he should return to the bosom of the Father, and send another divine personage of equal power and glory, who should plead his cause and convince the world of his righteousness in claiming to be the Son of God. When the Spirit of truth is come "he shall testify of me;" "he shall glorify me." The presence of the Holy Spirit on this memorable occasion was announced by miraculous signs and attestations. Speaking through the twelve apostles, before an audience of "devout men, out of every nation under heaven," he begins his work of justifying the Lord Jesus, and bearing witness to his divine sonship, by declaring that God, to whom the Savior had made his appeal, had reversed the unjust decision of wicked men by owning and crowning him as his Son in the presence of all the heavenly hierarchies. As a result of the testimony which the Spirit on this occasion bore to Jesus, three thousand persons boldly avowed their faith in him as the Son of God.

The last miraculous manifestation of the Spirit which claims our attention, as having for its object the testimony of Jesus, is that which extends over the apostolic ministry. While the Spirit was to occupy the position of comforter to all Christians, to the apostles, the first preachers of the gospel, he sustained a peculiar and extraordinary relation, being to them the Spirit of truth, of miraculous power and divine wisdom. "We have received," says Paul, "not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God." Clothed with the mantle of their Master's authority, their mental faculties quickened and energized by an agency supernatural and divine, those humble men became the mighty power of God for pulling down the strongholds of Satan, and proving, by the demonstration of the Spirit, as evinced in signs, wonders, and miracles,

that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. Not to human wisdom, power, or strength, nor to worldly greatness, rank, and influence; but to a mighty, invisible agency, even the Spirit of truth working through the apostles, and thus bearing witness for Christ, must the marvelous and extraordinary success of the gospel, during the first age of the church, be ascribed. Though the mystic light of the Shekinah no longer symbolizes a present Deity as dwelling in a tabernacle or temple made with human hands, though the vestal fires on ancient pagan altars have been extinguished in endless night, and the altars on which they burned have turned to dust, yet the presence of God in the human soul, an inhabitation of Jehovah through his Spirit in the hearts of men on Pentecost, kindled a fire which consumed to ashes heathen fanes and temples, a fire which all the floods of persecution were not able to extinguish, and which shall burn on unquenchably until every dark corner of the earth shall be lit up with "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

"If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son,"—even the testimony of the water, the blood, and the Spirit. L.

L.'s ARTICLE.—That the foregoing article evinces much thought on the subject of which it so clearly speaks, must be obvious to every one who carefully reads it. But whether L. has brought out and made especially prominent the exact and intended meaning of the passage may be held as still further debatable. I strongly incline to think that the testimony of the passage is purely monumental; that is, it is the testimony of three monuments,—immersion, the supper, and the New Testament. Immersion, being a constantly recurring act in water, carries the mind back to Christ as its author, and also embodies the idea of his own burial and resurrection; the Lord's supper, as showing forth his death till he comes again; and the New Testament, as being ever present and speaking of him. Destroy these monuments, and the knowledge and faith of Christ would, at last, perish from the world.

THE TREASURE IN EARTHEN VESSELS.

A DISCOURSE BY J. B. GRUBBS.

[“We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus’ sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.”—2 Cor. iv., 5-7.]

THE name of the greatest orator of ancient Greece is often heard in connection with that of the greatest orator of ancient Rome; yet no two men ever differed more widely as orators or as men than they. When the Roman orator addressed the multitude, they could never lose sight of the man; and forgetful of his theme, they went away praising the splendor of his eloquence, the matchless power of his oratory. The orator of Greece likewise held the people entranced, but not in admiration of him. His own soul kindled with ardor under the burning influence of his theme, while with indescribable earnestness he poured forth a torrent of living eloquence, which literally consumed every species of opposition to the sentiments he wished to enforce. The effect upon the multitude was such that, losing sight of the orator himself, and thrilled with the subject alone, they burned with the ardor of enthusiastic desire to execute the measures proposed. Now these two great men may be regarded as types of two different classes of preachers. There are those who preach as Cicero spoke, who never, while preaching, lose sight of themselves, nor permit the audience for one moment to forget them, who “shake their vain limbs about with vast surprise,” and preach as though Christ and the gospel were things of secondary consideration, and themselves alone the objects of primary interest. These can not say, with Paul: “We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus’ sake.” Whatever “excellency of power” they possess is of themselves, not of God. On the other hand, hear what Paul, as a noble representative of the opposite class, has to say of himself: “And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. * * And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.”

When the word of God is so presented that all else is lost sight of but the word itself, it then proves itself, indeed, to be “the power of God unto salvation,” and for this reason Paul proclaims his readiness “to preach the gospel” even in Rome, that, among the Romans, he “might have some fruit, even as among other Gentiles.” It is for this reason also that the same apostle

elsewhere affirms that "after that, in the wisdom of God, the world, by wisdom, knew not God, it pleased God, by (what the boastful Greeks had called) the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe." Salvation is thus conditioned on preaching—the faithful preaching of the word of God. Of this the apostle has furnished a conclusive and satisfactory demonstration in the following paragraph: "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Rom. x., 12–14.) Can not be saved without calling upon the Lord; can not call upon him without believing in him; can not believe in him without hearing of him; and can not hear of him without a preacher. Can not be saved, then, without a preacher. Such is the logic of the great apostle to the Gentiles. "So then," he adds, "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," *i. e.*, faith comes by hearing the word of God. Those who object to baptism for the remission of sins, upon the ground that it suspends too much upon the agency of man, should consider whether the objection does not lie equally against all who admit faith in Christ to be essential to salvation. For "how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" We are thus, according to Paul, as much dependent upon human agency for faith itself as for the administration of the ordinances of Christianity. And if it pleases God thus, through the instrumentality of preaching, to save them that believe, it is not our privilege to be displeased at this method of the divine procedure.

"Seeing," says Peter, "you have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that you love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever. * * * And this is the word which, by the gospel, is preached unto you." Peter here suspends as much upon preaching as Paul in the paragraph formerly quoted. Consider his teaching: We are born of incorruptible seed—born again by the word of God—born of the word which, by the gospel, is preached unto us. Nothing exceeds this in clearness, and, together with the searching questions of Paul, it cuts at the very root of that popular theory, according to which the human soul is regenerated without the word of God, without faith, and without the ordinances of the Christian religion.

To complete the argument and establish forever the efficiency and power of preaching—the preaching of the word of God—we quote the following passage: "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us ; we pray you, in Christ's stead, be you reconciled to God." In this passage there are four expressions that are worthy of special notice. The apostles are said to be "ambassadors for Christ." To them was "committed the word of reconciliation." It was by them that "God did beseech" men to be reconciled to him. And they, "in Christ's stead," did thus exercise "the ministry of reconciliation." An ambassador is a representative of sovereignty, and to act "in Christ's stead," is to act as his ambassador. In this way it was that God, who "was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," did beseech men, through the apostles, to accept the blessings of this reconciliation. Hence the following authoritative declaration of the Messiah : "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me ; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." This is general. The following is more specific as having special reference to the twelve : "He that receiveth you receiveth me ; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." Hence the great commission : "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations." The logical power of this illative "therefore" may be fully understood when we comprehend the fact that the apostles were here elevated to the dignity of "ambassadors for Christ," and acting henceforth "in Christ's stead," were to carry the message of salvation to the ends of the earth. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; he that believeth not shall be condemned." It is thus, by the instrumentality of preaching, that God is pleased "to save them that believe ;" and from the date of this commission until time shall be no more, the will of the divine Father can only be known from the lips of the apostles. He "hath committed unto us," says Paul, "the word of reconciliation." Behold the power that saves, converts, and reconciles man unto God committed unto men ! Who but the ignorant shall pray "that converting power may descend from above ?" "The righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise : Say not in thy heart, who shall ascend into heaven ? that is, to bring Christ down from above ; or, who descend into the deep ? that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead. But what saith it ? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart ; that is, the word of faith which we preach ; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

Does this commission of saving power to men, this transfer of "the ministry of reconciliation," this impartation of "the power of God unto salvation," make saviors of these "ambassadors for Christ ?" No ; says Paul, "we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face (the person) of Jesus Christ." The "earthen vessels" have long since mouldered to their mother

clay, and await the resurrection morn; but the power that was in them is moving my spirit even now. This can never die. "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever." As the medical power, the healing remedy, of every physician is deposited in the vessels prepared for his use, so in "chosen vessels" of the Lord he deposited his spiritual "balm of Gilead." Though in them, it is not of them; and though not of them, it is yet in them and nowhere else, for God no longer speaks to the world except through his Son, and the Son speaks only through the apostles, while they speak now to us through the Scriptures alone. In this way therefore, they are still "earthen vessels" to us. We can not communicate with them except through the New Testament, and as long as this book is authoritative in heaven or on earth, the apostolic ministry will never fail. Who that imagines that God, through the Spirit, now directly acts upon the human mind in the communication of ideas, impressions, or hopes, can have any just conception of the ministry of the apostles? Impossible. All such, in fact, virtually ignore the apostolic ministry altogether, and seek not the illumination which "shined in the hearts" of the apostles, "to give the light of the glorious knowledge of God in the person of Jesus Christ."

The argument, we think, is complete, and we now seek an illustration in the history of two or three cases of conversion recorded by Luke. Before advertng to these we must observe that men, under the guidance and training of the apostles, and acting by their authority, were but carrying out the apostolic commission. "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses," says Paul to Timothy, "the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." In the same way those who are now, by means of the Christian Scriptures, instructed in the things taught by the apostles, and who proclaim these things to others, are simply acting as mediums through which the apostles themselves carry out the commission they received. Whoever proclaims what they have never authorized, not only does that which is utterly null and void in itself, but incurs, for this act, the displeasure of heaven. "If any man," says Paul to the Galatians, "preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." It follows that all acceptable religious proceedings, both now and heretofore, since the ever-memorable Pentecost, are but constituent parts of the apostolic ministry.

We are now ready for our first illustration. "And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying: Arise and go toward the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert." The distance that Philip had to travel in fulfilling this command was probably not less than eighty miles. As the angel could move as upon wings of light, why did he not himself fulfill the mission upon which this evangelist was commanded to go? Or rather, instead of descending from heaven to a man in Samaria, many miles north of Jerusalem, why did he not descend

at once to the road leading south (or southwest) "from Jerusalem unto Gaza," and accomplish, without human agency, the work he assigned to this man? The true answer is, that Philip, as an "earthen vessel," was in possession of a "treasure," that the angel, a heavenly agent, did not possess, and the use of this "treasure" was necessary to the accomplishment of the mission in view. Philip, accordingly, promptly obeyed: "He arose and went; and behold, a man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure, and had come up to Jerusalem to worship, was returning, and sitting in his chariot, read *Esaïas* the prophet. Then the Spirit said unto Philip: Go near, and join thyself to this chariot. And Philip ran thither to him, and heard him read the prophet *Esaïas*, and said: Understandest thou what thou readeest? And he said: How can I, except some man should guide me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him." Behold now the intervention of another agent, not only heavenly, but divine: "The Spirit said unto Philip, Go near." Why did not the Spirit, without any agency of Philip, do this? The Ethiopian, we learn, was puzzled over the passage he was reading; and the prayer of David: "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law," has often been quoted to prove that the Spirit, without other agency, illuminates the minds of those who sincerely seek divine aid. What a splendid opportunity presents itself here for this work of the Spirit! And why was not the tedious eighty-miles trip of the evangelist Philip thus dispensed with? Faith in Christ would have been the result of this illumination, for the passage under the eye of the Ethiopian was that in the fifty-third chapter of *Isaiah*, which describes the crucifixion of Christ. But no; according to God's own arrangement, "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Therefore "Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." Verily "it pleases God through the foolishness (the instrumentality) of preaching, to save them that believe," and such was the result in the eunuch's case, for he obeyed the truth and "went on his way rejoicing."

Our next example is stronger still: "There was a certain man in *Cesarea* called *Cornelius*, a centurion of the band called the Italian band; a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always. He saw in a vision evidently, about the ninth hour of the day, an angel of God coming to him, and saying, unto him: *Cornelius*. And when he looked on him, he was afraid, and said, What is it, Lord? And he said unto him: Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God." Note now the peculiarity in this case. The angel is sent not now to a preacher, but directly to the man for whose benefit he is sent; and certainly one would think that he will impart to that man such instruction in the divine will as he needs. But what is the truth? Let us hear what he says: "Send men to *Joppa*, and call for *Simon* whose surname is *Peter*, who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." Why did not the angel speak

those words himself? Simply and solely because God had deposited in "earthen vessels" that "treasure" which Cornelius needed to make his happiness complete in the enjoyment of salvation through Christ. One of these vessels was at that time in the city of Joppa, some thirty miles distant, and must of necessity be sent for; for it was the one which had beforehand been appointed by the Lord to dispense to the Gentiles the words of eternal life. This is according to the account which Peter himself gave of this transaction many years subsequently in the apostolic conference at Jerusalem. "Brethren, you know that a good while ago, God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe." The Holy Spirit was on this occasion miraculously conferred upon Cornelius and his friends in order to break down the prejudices of the Jews against the extension to the Gentiles of those blessings to which they thought themselves exclusively entitled.

One other illustrative case shall cap the climax of this series, and with this our argument will close: "And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high-priest and desired letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem. And as he journeyed he came near Damascus; and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said: Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said: I am Jesus whom thou persecutest, it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said: Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" What now is the grand peculiarity in this case? Who is it that appeared to Saul upon the highway? Not simply an angel, as in the case of Cornelius. "Who art thou, Lord?" is the question of Saul; and the response, "I am Jesus whom you persecute." It was the Lord Jesus Christ himself, "the Author and Finisher of the faith,"—"the way, the truth, and the life" to all who seek salvation from sin and from death. And directly to him the trembling and penitent Saul propounded this question: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Did the Savior forget that he had commissioned the apostles, and those by them authorized to answer this question—that to men here on earth he had "committed the ministry of reconciliation?" He did not; but to the sinner replied: "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do?"

In the three cases of conversion before us, taken together, we find that two angels, the Holy Spirit, and the Savior himself were personally connected with the incidents involved, and yet not a syllable of God's will in relation to God did they communicate in any case. And could we converse with the Savior to-day, and present directly to him the question of Saul, we might expect to be directed for a reply to Damascus, Cesarea, or Jerusalem, and this would indeed be enough. Were an angel even now to descend from the skies and proclaim aught that we have not already, we should turn away from him repeating the language of Paul:

"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." And if miracles were added as proof of his mission, his miracles would only confound, not convince.

Such is our faith in the gospel—we may say, in the Bible, and in Jesus, the Bible's great theme. It will never give place to any pseudo-progressive philosophy of men, of angels, or demons. False, diversified, conflicting systems of rationalism, infidelity, nonsense, born of learned ignoramuses, will arise, flicker, and vanish away. The word of God "liveth and abideth forever." It is the grand embodiment of all divine utterance to man—the last ever to be spoken within the area of time. "He who commanded the light to shine out of darkness," hath shined away that darkness forever. Even so, "the light of the glorious knowledge of God," which illumines the face of his Son, "the brightness of his glory," will be a "pleasure forevermore" to those who shall partake of "the inheritance of the saints in light."

SUSPENSION OF THE QUARTERLY.

BRETHREN, I am under the necessity of stating that with the present number I am compelled to suspend the *Quarterly*. This suspension grows wholly out of the fact that I have not the means to carry on the work longer. Whether, therefore, it shall die here or be continued depends on what its friends may see fit to do for the work. I am willing still to work for it, provided I am sufficiently encouraged to do so; but I am not willing to work for it as I have heretofore done. With the exception of the second volume, my labor has been bestowed on it as a gratuity. This I propose now to quit. Hereafter, if I work for the *Quarterly*, it must pay me; otherwise I have written my last page for it. With six hundred more paying subscribers I can finish the present volume. With my brethren rests the issue.

Many have been the complaints that the *Quarterly* has been issued irregularly. The fact is admitted, and needs explanation. My support has not been derived from the *Quarterly*, but from preaching. My preaching has been done over a large section of country. This has kept me much from home. It has hence been simply impossible to write, receive, and return proof to my printer regularly. I have done all that was in my power.

Again: the *Quarterly* has not been what at the first I designed to make it. I wanted each number to contain one hundred and fifty pages, instead of one hundred and twelve. I hoped it would so far support me as to enable me to give almost my whole time to it. Could this have been the case, and could I have written a hundred pages of each number, I could have made the work what it has never been. This is what I would wish still to do; and what, with the countenance of my brethren, I am willing to do. But the issue now remains with them. The *Quarterly* ought to have five thousand subscribers. With this number I could make it sparkle like a gem, and achieve incalculable good. Never has so great a necessity existed for the work as at present. The great cause needs it; the brotherhood need it. Shall they have it? This question they, not I, must answer. If they decree that not through the *Quarterly*, then I still work on in some other way.

THE CHRISTIAN HERALD.

VOL. 2.

JUNE, 1865.

No. 6.

The Law of Life.

A SERMON, PREACHED BY J. S. SWEENEY, IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, DUQUOIN, ILL., LORD'S DAY EVENING, JUNE 11, 1865.

Reported, Phonographically,
FOR THE CHRISTIAN HERALD, BY
REV. E. H. WARING.

In his testimony concerning Jesus, John makes this statement, 1: 4: "*In him was life, and the life was the light of men.*"

I purpose, according to promise, to call your attention to the law of life, as suggested in this portion of God's word. All existences are regulated by law. We see this all around us, as we shall have occasion to notice as we proceed. Now, there are two kinds of law: what is called organic law, or constitutional law; and what is called statutory law. In a state—in a government—these two kinds of law obtain: indeed they obtain universally, among all existences. What we call constitutional law is necessary to the very existence of a thing which it regulates. Statutory law is that that may be changed without endangering the existence or nature of the thing or government governed thereby. For instance, if

the organic law of our government be changed, our government itself is changed. If the organic law of our government be destroyed, then the very government itself is destroyed with it. And this is true of everything that is governed by law. The constitutional or organic law, by which a thing may be governed, is necessary to its existence. To change it is to change its existence; to destroy it is to destroy its existence. This is not true of statutory law. Our statutes may be changed without interfering with the existence of the government. I propose now to show that this is true with regard to life—all kinds of life.

But when we begin to reason with our friends, who are inclined to doubts and skepticism, with respect to the christian religion, we are usually met with this general objection to christianity:—"Your religion is a religion based upon miracles; and I am not disposed to receive anything that claims, or depends for its authenticity upon a miracle. Show me anything I can understand all about, any thing tangible, any thing I can see, or investigate; and if it commends itself to my reason, I will receive it. But when you come to me with your religion, based upon mir-

ade—upon an assumed interference with the regular laws of nature—you appeal not to my judgment, not to my reason, but to my superstition and, therefore, I reject it.”

The objection to christianity founded upon the assumed unreasonableness of miracles, lies as I will show, against all existences. The man who rejects christianity because it had its beginning in miracle, must doubt the real existence of every thing else. Let us look at it. There is an oak. You know what that is; you know it is a real *bona fide* oak. “Oh Yes,” you say. But whence came that oak? You say, “It came from the acorn.” Well, I understand that; that is true: it did come from the acorn; but whence came the acorn? You say, “It came from the oak.” But that is reasoning around. The acorn came from the oak, and the oak from the acorn. But now I ask you, which was first, the oak or the acorn? And if you assume that the acorn was first, then there was an acorn without an oak to produce it, and that is contrary to the regular law of reproduction, as we see it operating all around us. There is an acorn without an oak; and I ask, whence came it? It came by miracle. But perhaps you say, “The oak came first.” Then there was an oak without an acorn; and that is a miracle. So that whether you say the oak was first, or the acorn, you are bound to admit that it had its origin in miracle.

But again: We take our position at the lake shore. We look out upon that beautiful, sparkling, placid body of water. Whence came it? Whence came this large and beautiful lake?

“Well,” say you, “this lake, this mighty basin, is fed by the rivers.” But what feeds the rivers? “The brooks, which are fed by the rills; which come from the little springs, on the mountain sides.” But how came these springs in the mountains? “Oh,” say you, “I can explain that. By evaporation the water was drawn from the lakes, and carried above us; and by certain atmospheric influences—the influences of cold and heat,—clouds were formed and this water gathered up; and by certain other influences, it was formed into rain, and fell upon the mountains, and was received into the pockets of the rocks; and thus the springs were fed; and these springs fed the rills, and the rills the brooks, and the brooks the rivers, and the rivers the lakes.”

Now, which was first, the springs in the mountains, or the mighty bodies of water, from which it is taken again to feed those springs? If you assume the springs were first, then there were springs of water not formed by the regular law; and there was miracle. “Oh, but,” you say, “the lakes were first.” Then there was a lake which was not formed by the rills, the brooks, the rivers; and that is miracle: so that which-ever way you turn, the water had its beginning in miracle. When you look upon the oak, you must confess a miracle has been performed; and when you look upon the lake, you are forced to make the same admission. But let us come into the animal department of the universe. There is the dove, innocent dove—Will you tell me which was first, the dove or the egg? If you assume the one, I

ask you whence came the other? and if you assume the other whence came the one? and so, which ever way you turn, there has been miracle; So that we find in the animal creation, every thing may be traced to miracle. Wherever we turn, we must conclude that existence came by miracle, though in the regular law, there is procreation and reproduction. If, then, the material world around us had its beginning in miracle, when God would build up a spiritual universe, is it unreasonable to suppose that He would bring it into existence by miracle also? If the oak, the lake, the animal—and you will see the same argument can be applied to man—all had their beginning in miracle, is it unreasonable to suppose that this spiritual universe had such an origin?

Having noticed this general objection of the skeptic, when we would make our religion reasonable, I now propose to call your attention to the law of life. The passage I have read says: "In him was life." Now, what is the law of life—the organic law of life—by which it is regulated, and to destroy which it ceases to be? What is the constitutional, or necessary law of life?

Now, there is a coarse sort of life even in a rock. There is vegetable life. There is animal life; and there is immortal life as brought to light in the gospel of Jesus Christ. And the same law that obtains in the life of the rock, obtains in the life of the vegetable, in animal life, in intellectual life, in immortal life. There is but one organic, or constitutional law of life.

"But," say you, "it seems to me there is no life in a rock." Well, go to the quarrier and he will talk to you about the live and the dead rock. I remember being in the very splendid and gorgeously finished mansion of a gentleman—it was a real palace—and we noticed a very beautiful rock in his mantle-piece. Some one observed that the rock was decaying, and said, "What a pity that beautiful rock is crumbling away." We were informed that an experienced sculptor had said that there was a *dead* place in that rock, and that it had been crumbling a little every year. It was not a live rock; but dead—dead.

So there is life in vegetation, and there is animal, intellectual and spiritual life. Now, as there is a law by which life is regulated; the question arises, what is the organic law of life?

I submit, it is UNION. Union is the law of life. That one word will express it. Take, if you please, that *living* rock from the quarry; and, with a hammer knock it to pieces, and you destroy the life of that rock. Union is the constitutional, or organic law of life everywhere. We can see this more palpably in *vegetation*. You can see it in the *water*. There is *living* and there is *dead* water. What is *living* water? It is water that is, in some way, connected with its fountain. But separate it from its fountain and what is the consequence? It becomes still, stagnant, *dead* water. But unite it with the great body of water, and it receives life, and is *living* water. Go to that tree, and all its parts are united;

and there is life and beauty. Separate a limb, and what is the result? You kill it; and why? Because you destroy the organic law of life which is union—union with the stock that sends its roots into the earth, and derives therefrom nourishment and life.

But come higher. Separate from that man his arm, and what is the result? The result to that arm is death, decomposition, decay. And why? Because you have destroyed the organic law of life, which is union with the source of life. Every particle, therefore, that is separated from the source of its life perishes, because in the act of such separation the organic law of life is destroyed. However, regulations may be made for the preservation of life, and altered and changed, it may be, without seriously affecting the life itself. But when you destroy the organic law of life, death will necessarily ensue.

I need not further elaborate this argument: it is apparent to every mind.

My next question is this: Has anything that we see around us life independently in itself? Now, Mr. reasoner, I want you to look that question full in the face. Has anything you see life independently in itself? I assert it has not. Let us look at it. The lake does not. It must have connection with other bodies of water in order to its life. And even these other bodies of water have no life in themselves. But this you will see more palpably by coming to vegetation. You have admitted that when the branch is severed from the trunk that where the organic law of life is destroy-

ed and the branch dies. Now, I ask you has the tree life? If you think so, then cut the connection between it and the ground on which it grows and it will die, as did the branch. And then separate that ground on which it stood from the earth around it and it too will die. So that we can not find any thing around us that has independent life in itself. That tree draws its life from the earth, and the earth must receive life from some other source. And now I assert that there is not a man under the broad heavens that can lay his hand upon any thing that is independent in its life. What is the life of the branch? You may say, the tree. But what is the life of the tree? You may say the earth. But what is the life of the earth?

Where will we land in these inquiries? We will never come to the existence that has life in itself. God, therefore, gives to all things life. He is the source of life; and, upon a final reference, all life must be traced to Him, otherwise we are lost in our investigations and researches after the source of life.

But I propose to speak now of immortal life. We have seen what is true with regard to life that we know is. The passage of God's word, with which I started out, says, "*In him was life.*" In Jesus Christ: mark that. "*In Him was life,*" and the *life* that was in Him was the *light* of men. There is no life independently in man. No, all life is the result of a great battle. The life of the oak comes from the death of other vegetation. And thus God gives life to every thing around us. But this

passage asserts that in Jesus Christ was life. He only hath immortality. We have seen that union is the organic law of life. Jesus Christ is the source of immortality. He only hath it, says the word of God. Now I am ready for this proposition:—That no man, in all the entire realm of humanity, possesses, or can possess, immortal life, without union with Jesus Christ. Can life be possessed, in any thing that we see around us, in the water, in vegetation, any where. Can life be possessed by any other law than that of union with the source of life? In Jesus Christ is life, In him is the immortal life, and we, when we teach that in union with him we may have immortal life, teach nothing that has not its analogy all around us. And yet you object to it, and call it miraculous, and say we appeal to your superstition and not to your reason! When I say that in him we have eternal life, that no man can have eternal life, but in union with Jesus Christ; there is a destination I want you to notice. I do not say, in him only men can have *existence*. It was not existence Jesus came to give: it was *life*.—Reasoning from this organic law of life, yet supposing that the life Jesus came to confer was eternal existence, some have come to the conclusion that no one will exist eternally but such as receive eternal existence from Jesus Christ. But what does our text say? “In him was life, and the life was the light of men. This life is not existence; but *light*; and light is but another word for glory. And what in Christ was *life* in us is *light*. Hence there is so much said of

“dwelling in the light,” and “walking in the light,” and hence, speaking of the condition of the wicked, it is called “blackness,” and “darkness.”

This immortal life, then, is not existence. In Christ it is called life; and you will observe that what is in him called life is in us light: “In him was life and the life was the light of men.” A man may have this life, in a measure, in this world, and in the ratio that he has the light of heaven, he has what in Jesus is called life. There is an intimate connection between light and all kinds of life, from vegetable life up to spiritual life.—Few things can live in the dark, so intimate is the connection between light and life. Take a plant into your cellar—there give it root in the dark cellar, and it will grow but very little. It will be only a sickly, succulent sort of plant; and if there is any life in it at all, you may let but a single ray of light into the cellar, and you will see that plant lifting itself, and moving and stretching towards the light, and on it goes to the place where the light comes into its dark abode, and it leaps out and grows, and spreads out its tendrils to the light. Light is essential to vegetation, and so it is to all kinds of higher life. But this life that is in Christ, is called “the light of men.” Now it is very singular that wherever Jesus is preached, and the gospel is believed, and men receive it, and come into connection with Christ; that there is light, intelligence, civilization. Take the knowledge of God as manifested in Christ, out of the world, and what is the result? The tendency of man

is into heathenish darkness. He goes from the light farther and farther—down deeper and deeper, and the longer he is absent from the light of heaven, the darker he is, until he gets to be little above the higher order of animals. But where there is union with Christ, man is elevated.—There you see Colleges, education flourishes, the arts and sciences are known and cultivated by the people. Now, what does this mean? It means that what in Christ is life, is in us light. Don't you know this to be true? If the world was now cut off from Christ it would sink down into blackness and darkness; and when the connection with the source of life, which to us is light, is completely severed, that is hell itself. And hence the wicked are to be banished "from the presence of the Lord," and are to go into "outer darkness."—Therefore, without union with Christ, the source of life, which in us is light, blackness and darkness is man's eternal destiny.

Now I propose to inquire briefly, what is the law of light? As we have seen that what in Christ is life, in us is light, now what is the organic law of light? The organic law of light is to shine. Prevent the shining and there is no light. It does not matter what your forms and ceremonies may be, brethren, it matters not what ordinances we may attend to; it matters not what we do that is external in its character; where there is no connection with Jesus Christ, there is no eternal life in us. "He that believeth on the son hath everlasting life." He dwells in the light, and the light dwells in him. If there

is, then, that connection with Christ, there is in us the life of Christ, and that life is light. What is the organic law of light? I have already answered that question. It is to shine. Now, take into connection with this passage, "In him was life and the life was the light of men," the Savior's language to the disciples, "Ye are the light of the world." That is, "you my disciples, are the light of the world; and the organic law of light is to shine. Take a candle, and place it upon one of these broad prairies, and you can see it for miles away. And why? Because it is its very nature to shine. Its very existence depends upon its shining. And says the Savior to his disciples, who are in connection with him, "Let your light so shine before men, that they, seeing your good works may glorify your Father which is in heaven." Mark it; he says "*Let* your light shine," not "*Make* it shine." If we are in connection with Christ we have the life of Christ, and that life is in us light, and we are not commanded to *make* but to *let* our light shine. To let it live by its organic law, which is to shine. And, therefore, there is such fitness in the expression "*Let* your light so shine."

Much, then, we say just here, depends upon us as to the salvation of the world. Therefore it is, we are called the light of the world. Therefore it is, the disciples of Jesus are called "The salt of the earth," for they are in connection with Jesus Christ, with the source of immortal life; and that life is light. have said, I believe a man may, in a meas-

ure, enjoy immortal life in this world. He has in his soul the light of Heaven, which is life—not *being*, but *life*. And light means glory, and glory means life. The glorious state is light, all is light there. There we shall see as we are seen and know as we are known, for we shall dwell in the fullness of glory for ever and ever. And the punishment of the wicked will be that he shall be taken away from the great source of life and light, to blackness and darkness for ever and ever.

I will now notice the practical part of my subject, and I shall be done.

“Let your light so shine that others seeing your good works may glorify your Father which is in heaven.” The salvation of the world depends, in a great measure, upon Christians, and the way that we are to bring the world into union with Christ is by letting our light shine. Now you know that in the Scriptures the term, grafting, is used in speaking of bringing persons into connection with Christ. They are grafted into Christ. You know if you take a bud from the branch, if it lives long, you must graft it, and connect it with life; and if that is properly done, it will live. Now you that are not in connection with Christ have no life; and if you would enjoy that life, which is light, and glory, and immortality, you must come into connection with Christ; and that is done by believing in him with all the heart, and submitting to his will. In this way you may be united to him, and then the law is, “Let your light so shine” that others may be brought to this light, and enjoy this life of heaven.

But how is this to be done? By letting others see “your *good works*.” That is the way it is to be done.—All the light we have is reflected from Jesus Christ. No man has light in himself. As there is no light in the moon or stars, but they are reflectors of the light of the sun; so there is no light in us independently, but our light comes from Jesus Christ, and is reflected from us. “Let your light so shine, that others may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven.” Do not, then, be exalted in yourselves. Feel not independent. Feel not proud and haughty, for your light is borrowed and you are a mere reflector of the light of heaven.

Now, in as simple a manner as I can, I shall show how we are to let our light shine, and thereby show that we have been in connection with Jesus Christ, and that there is a connection between us and the fountain of life. It is by “good works.” There is a single expression of the apostles’ which gives the whole life of Christ: “He went about doing good.” If we are in union with Christ and partakers of life in him, which is the light of men, we can only show it by “doing good.” This is letting our light shine, and we may say that we know him—we may say that we have eternal life abiding in us; but unless we do good, our actions contradict our words, and “actions speak louder than words,” and more correctly than words; and especially is this true in this case.—You can convince me, therefore, that you are in connection with Jesus Christ, only by doing good; by obey-

ing the law of God. Doing that, you spread light wherever you go; and men will see it, and it will draw them to the Lord Jesus Christ, the source of life and eternal glory.

Illustrative of this, I will relate a little piece of history.

I knew a lady, some years ago, a part of whose history I received from herself. In her early life, perhaps when yet but 13 years of age—having read of Christ in Sunday School, having been taught of the Savior by her parents, and in the Church, she gave her heart to Him. She came and submitted to him, and was engrafted into him, and made a partaker of his nature. She said to me, “when I became a christian I asked a single petition of my heavenly Father, and I asked it earnestly, and fervently and continually. And that was that he would let me live till I could see I had done something to spread the glorious light abroad, that filled my heart with peace and joy.” She said, God had answered that prayer. At the early age of sixteen she married a man who was in the first stage of infidelity. He averred that everybody would eventually be saved.—They removed to the far West, and she was separated from her friends, her parents and the Church; and in the place where they lived there was no Church, no society of Christians, and wickedness abounded there.—They had not been there long before her husband took the second degree. He became a deist, and persisting in this, he was raised to the sublime degree of an infidel. Though thus situated, this young woman was determined to let her light shine. She

kept herself constantly in connection with Jesus Christ. And the word of Christ, will keep up the connection between believers and the Savior, even if they have no church with which to be associated. Christ was her life all the time, and he was her light too. I was told by some of her neighbors, that after she had been there about two years, at a gathering among them—for they had gatherings, but not for religious purposes, but for purposes of pleasure and amusement—at this gathering she appeared to be reserved, and on being asked why she did not contribute to the entertainment of those present; as did the others? she said if they desired it she would; and she took the word of God and turned to where it speaks of glory, the glory of heaven, and claimed her portion of the time for the word of the Savior. It did not strike them very favorably; but there was no objection, and she proceeded.

I was preaching some fifty miles from there, and received a letter from her. In that letter she said; she was in the far West—separated from her friends and the church she loved, that the people were very irreligious and wicked. “But,” said she, “I have been laboring and praying for something better, and I have heard of your preaching, and I want you to come and preach here. I have no money to pay you; my husband is an infidel, and will not help me; but though I am poor, if necessary rather than to do without the word of life, I will work with my own hands at night for the means to pay your expenses.” I went there, with another

brother in the ministry; and we had been there only about five days, when we organized a church of some thirty members; and that can't be done where there has been no light shining.—This Sister's light had been shining, and it had been seen, and among those converts was her husband, who had been convinced of the truth and led to Christ. At the close of our meeting this Sister said: "I am just now ready to die." "Why," said I, "I should suppose you were just ready to live." "No," she replied, "I am just ready to die. When I was brought to Christ I prayed fervently, that God would let me live, till I could see that I had done some good in the world. Now I have seen my husband, and my neighbors, to whom I am so much attached, brought to Christ; and I am now ready to die." Such is the effect of letting our light shine, and such the joy that obedience imparts. And now, dear friends, is the light of life in your soul—in your breast? Do you know that such is the intimate connection between *every* soul united to Christ, and himself, that he accounts every thing done to them as done to him? In the judgment day when he shall say, "I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger, and ye took me in, naked, and ye clothed me, sick, and ye visited me, in prison, and ye came unto me;" and when his disciples shall say: "Lord, when, did we these things unto thee?" Then shall he say unto them: "Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Yes, Jesus re-

gards everything done to his people as if done to himself; for they are but branches, grafted into him, partaking of his life. We are but a part of Jesus Christ; and from him we inherit eternal life; that is, the life of glory, which shall be eternal.

And, my friendly alien; unless there is an intimate and personal connection formed between your spirit and Jesus Christ, your soul has no life—this life of which I speak, which is light and eternal glory. And if this life is not in your soul, in that day, you will be separated from God, and banished from his presence, and though you may here borrow and sponge upon the disciples of Christ a little while, you will not have that privilege there; for there you will not be permitted to see the light as reflected from those branches of Jesus Christ—those tapers from the great Sun of Righteousness—but all seeming connection will be cut off between you and Christ, and blackness and darkness will be your portion for ever.

Then, if you have seen the light shine out from heaven, permit not the god of this world to blind your mind that the light shine not there; but welcome the light from heaven, and so you may become a part and parcel of Christ's Body. O, will you share this glorious light, and prepare your spirit by God's grace, for the light and glory that is boundless, unimagined, indescribable, in God's presence for ever and ever. May God bless you. Amen.

To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice,

Epistle to the Hebrews.

II. Having previously considered the question of authorship, we come now to the second question; namely: To whom was it written? In reply, we would say, To the Israelites; to those who understood the law of Moses; generally to the believing Jews or Israelites; but doubtless, more particularly to that portion of them who dwelt at Jerusalem, where the Jewish religion was most successfully carried on. Not to unbelievers, for he called them; "Holy brethren," "Partakers of the heavenly calling" &c., and of these, not to the apostles and others enjoying spiritual gifts, if there were any there at that time, but to the common people; for he says: xiii: 7, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever," 17. "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give an account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief." Such language would not be appropriate for the Elders or officers, and we find no language directed expressly to them. Doubtless he expected them to show it to their unbelieving brethren or neighbors, though it was *not* written to the Jewish nation generally, as several passages will show. "For ye had *compassion* on me in my bonds." This language could not apply to the unbelieving Jews, for they were the very persons that had bound him.

He, also, calls them "holy brethren," "partakers of the heavenly calling;" titles wholly inapplicable to unbelievers. And as we have before said, this may be one reason why he has not prefixed his name; knowing the prejudice existing in their minds against him, so that its being there might forever close the door against their conviction and conversion.

III. What is the purpose or object to be effected by the epistle? To prevent the Jewish brethren from apostasy. Many of them had, perhaps, already given up the faith and gone back to Judaism. In the sixth chapter, he tells them that "it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, when they have fallen away, to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." He then shows them in a figure the punishment of those who thus fell away, and concludes that part of his subject by saying: "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak."

To accomplish his purpose, he proves from the Old Testament Scriptures, the superiority of the Son over angels, then over Moses; and consequently the superiority of the new dispensation over the old. Again he shows the defects of the Levitical priesthood, namely that the high priest could not continue by reason of

death; that the blood of bulls and of goats, though offered every year, could *never* take away sin, but there was a continual remembrance made of it every year. On the other hand, Jesus forever lives being made a high priest forever, after the order of Melchisedek, to whom even Abraham, the great progenitor of all the Jewish or Levitical priests, paid tithes, and consequently is much greater than they, for the less pay tithes to the greater. Again, Jesus had no need to offer sacrifice for his own sins, but he once for all time and eternity, purged us with his own blood, and is seated at the right hand of God, there to make intercession for those that come to God by him.

He also proves from the Psalms that there yet remains a rest, in the future, for the people of God; that they had not yet entered into it; that the land of Canaan was only typical of the *true rest*." So of the Tabernacle and all the worship connected with it. He then cites them to the awful punishments inflicted for negligence and disobedience under the Mosaic dispensation, and since the Christian dispensation is so much superior, and its blessings so much greater, how much greater should be its punishments: He then exhorts them to continue steadfast. He reminds them of what they had already enjoyed, in the Church, as well as of what they had suffered for Christ's sake. He cites them to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and a host of others, who had died in faith not having received the promise; to an innumerable company which he compares to spectators eagerly beholding their zeal in the

Christian race; and finally winds up with some matters of personal interest to himself and Timothy.

This epistle though like most or all the others, not written to all Christians, yet like them, may be of great service to all. It explains many passages in the Old Testament, which, without it, would, doubtless, be very obscure to many minds. It adds much interest to the study of the Tabernacle worship, and gives some thrilling exhortations to perseverance in the Christian race.

PUPILLUS.

The Greatest Error in the World.

Is simply this: making the human conscience the true guide in matters of religion. Reader, if you are surprised at this remark, I request you to read the following; and if you have held this doctrine yourself you will be surprised that you never saw the error before.

Webster's primary definition of conscience is as follows: *Internal or self knowledge, or judgment of right and wrong; or the faculty, power, or principle within us, which decides on the lawfulness or unlawfulness of our actions and affections, and instantly approves or condemns them.*

It is therefore preached and believed, that conscience is an *internal monitor* placed in every person by the God that made us, and that this monitor, is our truest and best guide in matters of religion, both as to its faith and its practice. You cannot believe it if you get a correct view of the following indisputable facts:

1st, It annihilates all the supernatural, all the Divinity of the religion of Christ, and makes it *natural*. And avers, that man arrives at the true knowledge of it, by his own natural wisdom. We know that this is not true if the Bible is true.

2d, God is just; and if he gave us such powers of conscience in our creation, he has so given to *all mankind*. The heathen then would be as well acquainted with the religion of heaven as those who call themselves enlightened Christians. But this we know is not true.

3d, If man is totally depraved, then his conscience is depraved; and who can believe that such a depraved conscience is the true guide to religion. This doctrine that conscience is so pure and such a true guide, totally annihilates the doctrine of man's depravity.

4th, It renders the Bible useless. For if the conscience is such a monitor, such a true guide, then we could arrive at religious duty as well without as with the Bible.

5th, It renders nugatory and useless all the Creeds. For if man's conscience tells him what is truth, and what is right; of what use is the creed? It can do no more.

6th, It renders useless all the inspired men of all time. For the pagan is as wise as the prophet; and the idolator as wise as the apostle, if conscience in man is the true light. If conscience dictates to us the law of Christian truth and duty; why the prophet—why the apostle?

7th, It nullifies the preaching of the Cross of Christ. Why should the preacher labor for two hours as some

do, to prove to his young convert, that sprinkling is baptism; and then come down from the desk and leave the matter after all, to his conscience? If the conscience of the convert, is to be the lawgiver, the arbiter in the matter, of what use is the sermon? or of what use is the Bible?

8th, It renders abortive and useless, all the missionary labors of great and good people, to enlighten and save the heathen. For if God is just in the distribution of his gifts, they have as good natural conscience as we have. Then they have the true guide to eternal life—according to this doctrine, of what use then the missionary labor?

9th, It makes prayer of little value. Why pray to God for light and knowledge, when we already have the unerring source of light and knowledge? Not in Greek—not in the words of others—but of our own personal knowledge.

10th, Why theological schools and Colleges; why an educated ministry; if conscience be the true guide? Why the study of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, in order to educate mankind in religion, if our own conscience knows enough of itself?

See that minister—a man of acknowledged learning and ability—he has just now finished a labored discourse on baptism, he has a young convert to baptize. He appealed to the languages, translated learnedly, and quoted copiously from church history to prove to this young convert, (ten years old,) that sprinkling, or pouring was baptism. But now he approaches the little boy and tells him that his own conscience must be the

guide, the arbiter in this matter, after all! Did you ever see anything more sublime! Of what use all his learning and ability?

11th, It positively contradicts the Bible from beginning to end. I will give but one example out of hundreds. Jesus says: "I am the true light that lighteth every man &c." How can this be true, if our conscience is the true light?

12th, The history of the world shows, that practically, the human conscience approves every doctrine in the world; from Mahometanism down to the latest ism, (if any one knows what it is.) Both Pagans, Jews and Christians all have an approving conscience for their religion. Therefore if it proves one of them true and right, it proves them all true and right. This is too much for any person to believe.

My conclusion is, that that is the greatest error which is most certain to mislead men; and which does so, in the greatest number of instances. Such is the error on the human conscience. It is the greatest humbug of the age. Practically, among protestants, it is destroying the influence of God's commands, and substituting therefor the notions of men. It is to *errors*, what the Irishman said, the Donkey was to the Rabbits; *the father of them all*. Here comes one who has been to Camp Meeting—he says he has got religion. You ask him in scripture language, have you "believed and been baptized." "Did you repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins?" He says, No, the preacher said it was not necessary to

be baptized for the remission of sins. He told me I would get religion at the mourner's bench by faith alone, and I believe I have got it, for my conscience bears witness with the spirit that I am born again. And on he goes (not just like the Eunuch,) rejoicing, his conscience approving his course. So does the pagan Mother go home rejoicing when she has sacrificed her own child—and her conscience approves her course. So does the Roman Catholic go home rejoicing, after confessing to the Priest and getting the pardon of his sins. And his conscience approves his course. If the conscience, proves that the one was justified and pardoned by faith only, it also proves the paganism of the pagan Mother, and the Roman Catholicism of the Catholic, to be equally true. And thus this doctrine is substituted for the plainest commands of God; while these plain commands are *ignored*; and made unnecessary! Believe it who can; I cannot.

But you refer me to Rom. ii: 14, 15, which reads as follows: "For when the Gentiles which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." You ask me if this passage does not prove that those pagan Gentiles were guided in their matters of religion, by their own natural thoughts and conscience. And you ask me to remember that Paul says of these same pagan Gentiles,

that they were "without God in the world." That is without his law covenant. Therefore they must have been guided by their natural conscience in the matters of religion.—Well, suppose they were. What kind of religion did they have? Paul says of them, that they "were carried away unto dumb idols." That they "did service unto them which were no God's. So they were idolaters also. But are we like them? Are we without God in the world, without his law? No. We have God's revealed word. So this Scripture does not apply to us at all.

I admit, that if God does place a people in a condition where they can have no revelation from him except nature; then Nature alone would be their guide. But such is not our condition; we have the Bible. And now let us hear what it says about conscience. In 1. Cor. viii: 10, 12, we have the term "Weak conscience." This would make it a weak guide, would it not? At Heb. x: 22, we have the term "Evil Conscience." Would this not make it an evil guide? At Titus i: 15, we have the term "Defiled Conscience." According to this it would be a *defiled guide*! At 1. Tim, iv: 2, we have the term "Conscience seared with a hot iron."—Dear me what a seared and unnatural guide this would be! But suppose these conditions should all obtain in the case of any one person; then, his religious guide, would be a "*Weak, Defiled, Evil, seared Conscience*."—Might we not say of such an one, "How canst thou, being evil, speak good things." Reader, if you have a clear head and an honest heart, you

cannot believe such a monstrosity.—Yet how popular is this error. Is it not true, that a large majority of protestant pulpits are dosing out this doctrine to their people regularly! Indeed, it is *the solace* administered to the person who manifests some desire to investigate the truth; and objects to some of the doctrines of the Creed or practices of the church.—How plainly the scriptures teach, that God's revealed word is the only reliable guide in religion. That Christians should be the same precisely, *every where*. Both in faith, in name, and in practice. That there should be no divisions among them. These are not only plainly taught; but they are necessary, and binding upon all Christians.

Yet you know that a majority of protestant pulpits are teaching directly contrary to these commands of God, regularly. And when their attention is called to these things. What is their plea? That the Bible authorizes Christians to adopt and wear the names of Towns, Ordinances, Rivers, &c. &c., as names of the church of Christ? No. That God's word teaches us to divide and subdivide the church into hundreds of antagonistic parties? No. That it authorizes and commands Christians to make a great many human Creeds? No. That it tells us to ignore the Lord's terms, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And substitute therefor, "Come to the mourners bench and be saved by faith only?" Or, instead of the Scriptural words "Buried with him in baptism;" we are told to say, and practice, "sprinkle a few drops on the face?" No sir,

no one can claim that the Scriptures teaches to thus alter the *name—The Faith*—and the *practice* of the church of Apostolic times. Yet these pulpits are doing so, and that continually. And these awful wounds and bruises thus given to the primitive church of Christ, are healed, or tried to be healed by this panacea; that it makes no difference what name we wear—what Creed we adopt—what doctrine we believe—what form of baptism we choose, or whether we choose any, if the heart is honest; if the conscience is satisfied!—And thus is the name, faith and practice of the church changed, and the whole is justified by the human conscience. Are we not then justifiable in calling it *the greatest error in the world*.

IOWA.

Reporting.

BRO. J. W. KARR:

Anciently the Apostles reported to their brethren, what the Lord had done through their instrumentality in winning souls to Christ, and the brethren received the same with joy and encouragement; hence, I deem it not amiss in preachers to report the fruits of their labor in the Lord. Does any one doubt such a right? says one to this. I reply that there has been many successful meetings held here and there, which the Evangelist refuses to report, under the plea that doing so indicated egotism or desire for mortal glory: doubtless in their case this would be so, as it is, the stand-point from which they view

all their labors, and the leading or only object of all their efforts. The earnest faithful laborer, I opine, is not troubled with any such narrow, shallow, notions; but speaks of these things for the glory of God and the encouragement of his fellow saints in the Christian conflict. To my mind nothing is more in place than a modest, serious, sensible report of a meeting where many found peace in the Savior's pardoning love. This enjoyment is often marred, however, by the objectionable style of these reports, concerning which I cannot forbear a few remarks. For instance: Some treat us to a half column of swell, tapering off on something like, "One noble soul joined by letter." Again, a meeting of great interest, many things connected with it of great interest and worthy of mention, is reported in about a dozen words, thus—"Bro. A., meeting closed last night at, B. Your brother, C." Should not all such extremes be avoided? Again, a long harangue of an exhortation in a report, to me seems an unnecessary appendage. Again, the frequent repetition of that letter found in the Alphabetic column between the letters H and J, is not "a thing of beauty" even should it be to the reporter "a joy forever." Once more, a desire to be noticed in a report where your labor had little or nothing to do with the results, is vanity and vexation. Lastly, an inclination to appropriate all as being the result of your effort, when in fact other brethren greatly assisted, is not the "beauty of holiness;" neither is it to write out an extravagant report over

some other brother's name. At least, so thinketh

SIGMA.

Letter from Br. Garriott.

Albia, Monroe Co., Iowa, }
June 25th, 1865. }

BELOVED BRO'S, DOWNS AND KARR:

The 2nd number of the 2nd volume of your most excellent paper, THE CHRISTIAN HERALD, fell into my hands the other day, by accident. While I am much pleased with the spirit and tone of your Periodical, I find one thing to object to, to wit: In the article headed "Methodists, Campbellites and other ites."

On the 57th, page you speak of the abolition, annihilation, destruction, of Methodism and Campbellism. Then, on page 58, you connect Baptism with Methodism and Campbellism, and seem to want them all annihilated. And then, in the second column, same page, you say, "let Methodists quit preaching Methodism; let Campbellites quit preaching Campbellism; let Baptists quit preaching Baptistism." This would do, better, if there existed a people who called themselves Campbellites. I once said to a Methodist preacher—just as I came out of the water from immersing several persons—who said that a certain brother would, on a certain day, expose the views of a certain people in the country, calling themselves Campbellites, "The gentleman will be so kind as to find them first." In your article, you acknowledge that there is such a people as Campbellites, and that they have their

preachers. I commenced preaching some thirty two years ago, in the southeastern part of Indiana, when there were but few preachers in that part of the state, and have been a constant laborer up to this time, I have labored in this state nearly eight years, have preached some in Missouri, and I must say, I have never found a Campbellite preacher yet, nor a Campbellite church.

I do not like for brethren to put an *ism* on a level with Methodism and other *isms*, unless that *ism* first exists. Not only so, but, in your admission you do that great and good man, Brother Campbell, great injustice, for one of his mottoes is: "*Style no man on earth your leader.*" When Bro. Campbell is crucified, and persons are immersed into his name, then, and not till then, have we a right to call them Campbellites—then we have the right, but not sooner.

Beloved brother, though a stranger to you in the flesh, I hope we are not strangers to the one hope and faith. Let us labor for that rest that remains for the people of God! Yours truly, in the one hope.

R. GARRIOTT.

Remarks.

Brother Garriott seems not to understand the spirit of the article in which the objectionable language is found. In the article of which we were speaking, Mr. Hartly had assumed that there is a people properly called Campbellites, and we, for the sake of the argument, but not otherwise, granted his assumption, and then gave Mr. Hartley, and every body else,

to understand that if, as he assumed, there was such a people as Campbellites, we had no affinity with them, was not their apologist, but, was to their *ism*, as to all *isms* of mere human origin, an uncompromising enemy. There are those, who, like Mr. Hartley, will maintain, against their own better information, that there is such an *ism* as Campbellism and such a people as Campbellites, and we generally find that an effort to convince them that their information or their moral honesty is at fault is unavailing; hence, we generally waive the discussion of the question, is there such a people? and admitting that there *may* be such a people, disclaim all affinity for, or connection with them. With a certain class of individuals it is utterly useless to affirm that there is no Campbellite church, for, besides all the difficulties usually attending the affirmation of a negative proposition, we are continually met by such men as this Baptist editor, who *know* (?) it is so; and, although you may never find one in all your travels, you will occasionally find somebody who will tell you, as we were told but yesterday, that, "There's lots of 'em down here about eight miles." The advocates of the different human systems, aware of their own inconsistencies, seem to desire to find some palliation in the assumed fact that there is such a system as Campbellism, and we sometimes give them the benefit of their assumption, false though it be; but we wish them distinctly to understand that we are

not the advocate of any human system—our business is the advocacy and defence of Primitive Christianity. We go for the Constitution and the Union—the Constitution of the King for the government of His kingdom, and the *union* of all of God's people in this one kingdom. We oppose the organization or the perpetuation of any and all confederacies, contrary to the Constitution, whether they be labelled Methodism, Campbellism or Baptistism, as being disloyal and revolutionary.

We think that our article would scarcely do injustice to Brother Campbell, for almost every one knows that his great life-work was to free the world from every sort of human *isms*, and build up the sect which was in the apostolic age, and still is, "everywhere spoken against."

No, brother Garriott, we have no notion of any letting down of the noble standard of our noble King, of affixing or prefixing any thing to that sacred name by which the disciples were first called at Antioch, and for which you have been pleading longer than it has been ours to live in the world, and for which you are still so justly tenacious. We want the Lord's people to be *one* people. We want the church, the bride, the Lamb's wife to wear the worthy name of her worthy spouse. When Campbell or Wesley or John the Baptist, has died for us and we have, by divine appointment, been baptized into his name, into his death, and have the inspired command, to walk in

him, then, and not till then, may we wear his name. May the Lord help those who are indeed Christ's to observe virtuous propriety in refusing to wear the name of another! K.

Query.

BRETHREN DOWNS AND KARR:—

What do you understand by the expressions of our Savior, (Luke 17: 20, 21,) "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation,"—* * "The Kingdom of God is within us?"

Please answer through the "Herald."

J. S. SROCK.

Iowa City, May 2nd, 1865.

REPLY.

For the reader's satisfaction, we will give a few of the various renderings of the passage alluded to by Bro. Shrock. Philip Doddridge, paraphrases it as follows: "And it was about this time that, being asked by some of the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God, which he had so often mentioned as approaching, should actually come, he answered them, and said, The Kingdom of God cometh not with that external pomp and observation of men which you expect. Neither shall they point to this or that remarkable place, and say, Behold, [it is] here, or, behold, [it is] there. For behold, and observe it attentively, the Kingdom of God is already among you: though, because it is an inward and spiritual Kingdom, created in the hearts of men, and not attended with outward

grandeur, you overlook it as unworthy your regards."

Wesley's Revision does not differ essentially from the Common Version. "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation," he says:—"With such outward pomp as draws the observation of every one."

The Translation by Doctors Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge, gives it as follows: "Being questioned by the Pharisees, when the Reign of God should commence, he answered, The Reign of God is not ushered in by parade; nor shall people say, Lo, here! or Lo, yonder! for behold the Reign of God is within you."

Dr. Clarke, in commenting on the 20th verse, says that Kypke and others have amply proved from the best Greek writers that the meaning of the original is, "With scrupulous observation," "As if he had said," he further remarks, "The Kingdom of God, the glorious religion of the Messiah, does not come in such a way as to be discerned only by sagacious critics, or is only to be seen by those who are scrupulously watching for it; it is not of such a nature as to be confined to one place, so that men might say of it, behold it is only here, or it is only there, for this very Kingdom of God is publicly revealed; and behold it is among you; I proclaim it publicly, and work these miracles which prove the Kingdom of God is come: and none of these things are done in a corner." The Doctor also gives the marginal readings found in our common Bible.

In the last place, we shall give the passage as rendered by H. T. Ander-

son in his admirable translation of the New Testament: "And being asked by the Pharisees, when the Kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said: The Kingdom of God comes not so as to attract attention; nor shall it be said, Lo here! or Lo there! for behold the Kingdom of God is among you."

It is clearly evident that many of the Jews—perhaps a large majority of them, expected to behold in the coming Kingdom, the splendor, parade and pageantry of earth; and that the reign of the Messiah would be a splendid succession of triumphs over their enemies, till the men of all nations should bow at the foot of his throne and do him homage. To correct this impression, the Savior said to them as we have seen: "The Kingdom of God comes not so as to attract attention." This of course, they could not—or at all events did not understand, for Paul tells us in the 2d chapter of his Corinthian letter, that had they in this mystery beheld the wisdom of God, "they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." The misconception on their part, which perhaps, more than anything else led to his crucifixion, was the notion that he was making an effort to establish a temporal Kingdom. They greatly feared the Roman power, and supposed that his public enunciation that he was the King of the Jews would excite the jealousy of that power, and ultimately lead to their own destruction as a nation. (See John 11: 47–51.) Jesus was a man of humble pretensions. His parentage, his nativity, his bearing, his works, his associations with men, were all in-

consistent with their preconceived notions and perverted ideas of the exalted character of the King of the Jews, in consequence of which, as such they rejected him, and rather than allow him endanger the life of the nation by heading an insurrection and causing a disturbance, they sought his life, and succeeded in taking it.

That Dr. Clarke, in the extract which we have quoted from him, takes a position somewhat different from the one here laid down, we are aware, but that the Doctor sometimes throws dust into the eyes of his reader we are also aware;—at least, the more he says about some passages, the less you understand them. He is generally very learned, often profound, sometimes so much so that it is indeed difficult for the reader to grasp his thought, and we have in some instances been led to doubt whether he at all times understood himself. The Savior, in using the words referred to, evidently sought to correct a false impression, and it would certainly be difficult to show that any one supposed that the Kingdom of God, when it should come, would be of such a character that only the sagacious critic could detect its presence, and determine in what locality it might be found. Yet such is the singular attitude in which the Doctor places the Savior,—that of saying to the Pharisees that the Kingdom of God would not come thus and thus, when there is not the slightest intimation that any Jew had the remotest idea that it would come in that way.

The expression, "The Kingdom of God is within you," as we have seen

from the foregoing quotations should, and would if the original idea were correctly expressed in our tongue, read, "The Kingdom of God is among you." This reading is easily understood, for the simple reason that when the language was spoken, the Savior was among them, and he had previously been anointed, (See Acts 10: 38) and was subsequently crowned King of Zion. The disciples also, who subsequently became citizens of the Kingdom were among them.—Indeed they were now being prepared for citizenship in the coming Kingdom. By piece-meal they were imbibing the principles and becoming familiar with the law which should obtain in the kingdom. Though the King was not yet crowned, nor the law of induction proclaimed, nor the anticipated subjects in the enjoyment of the privileges and immunities of citizenship, the Savior and King could with beautiful propriety, say to the Pharisees in answer to the question, "When will the kingdom of God come?" "It is among you." This Bro. Shrock, is what we understand by the expressions to which you have called our attention. We are not infallible, and consequently may be in error, but these are our settled convictions. We do not know that the salvation of any man depends on his ability to understand those expressions, but if light may be elicited we are anxious to receive it. May the Lord bless us all, and enable us with unbiased minds, to investigate his holy truth, and so live in accordance with its teachings that it may be ours to possess an inheritance in the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

D.

Indeed!

What means that little word, "indeed?" It means in reality. Love indeed, religion indeed, wisdom indeed, means true, genuine, real love, religion, wisdom, or faith. Indeed is composed of two words, "in" and "deed," that is, "in action." Bible love, religion, wisdom and faith, are recognized as the true, genuine article when they exist "in deed," when they are developed in action, not otherwise. They must exist in the heart, but not merely exist, they must reign; control the intellect, the affections, and the will, and hence, rule the man. If any other principle is the ruling power—then love, religion, wisdom and faith, are counted as "dead." What is the Bible definition of each of these principles, not of the dead, but the true, genuine article.

1st, Love. "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments." So of brotherly love. "Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up the bowels of his compassion, from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children let us not love in word but *in deed* and in truth."

2nd, Religion. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." This is religion of the heart, but not in the heart only, it is religion in deed.

3d, Wisdom. "Behold the fear of

the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding."—Again wisdom in deed.

4th, Faith. Says James "faith without works is dead" but "by works was faith made perfect." God will not accept that as faith, that is not faith *in deed*. It is not perfect, not complete, will not save. "If a man say he hath faith, and have not works, can faith save him?" James answers no! "Faith without works is dead." Wicked men and devils have this faith. But suppose a man acts out his faith or belief, will his faith or believing save him then?—James answers yes. "By works was faith made perfect." A thing cannot be more than perfect. When you add to the perfect, you make it imperfect. Faith "in deed," believing carried out into action, is the perfect faith that saves; the faith by which we are justified, the faith that is imputed to us for right. That freezing, starving sister, will not thank you for that feeble love, that can go no farther than to say, "depart in peace." If selfishness is the reigning power, controlling the will, so that your love does not act and supply her need, she will not call it love. She wants love "in deed." So if the present, the seen, the love of this world is the ruling power, governing the will and actions of a man, so that faith, the belief in the unseen and the future (for all the truths of the gospel have respect to the unseen and the future) is not the reigning principle, producing correspondent action, God will not accept this as faith. It is not saving faith, it is not faith "in deed." Faith must be enthroned in the

thoughts and affections, must controul the will, and hence produce action, must be developed in deeds, or it is good for nothing. Who was ever benefited by believing any truth until his belief prompted him *to act* in accordance with the truth believed? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Believes what? the gospel. He that believes the plan of salvation revealed in the gospel, and acts out his belief by conforming to the gospel plan, shall be saved. That plan includes repentance and baptism. "He that believeth not shall be damned." The Bible just as distinctly and positively asserts that they who "obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power," as it asserts "he that believeth not shall be damned." Obeying the gospel, is just as essential as believing the gospel. If repentance and baptism are a part of the gospel commands, they must be obeyed at our peril. Our believing amounts to nothing at all, God will not accept it, will not call it faith, unless it be faith *in deed*. The very use of faith is to impel to action, and the miser might as well expect his gold locked up in his chest, locked up forever, to benefit him, as the sinner to expect his belief to save him, unless he uses his faith and acts. The miser is the veriest pauper in reality; poor, emphatically poor, though he has the means of plenty in his possession. Poor, because he does not use his gold. How many thousand sinners do believe enough gospel truth to save them, to procure them forgiveness of sins,

eternal life, and an inheritance in Heaven? Yet they peril all and at last are bankrupt eternally, just because they make no use of their belief of the truth. They do not act any more than if they never heard or believed the gospel. They have faith but it is not faith *in deed*.

J. J. MILES.

From the Review.

THAT SERMON:

O what a sermon! I never heard any thing more eloquent. From first to last, it was a complete success. Each sentence seemed a pearl strung on a silver thread; each had a golden clasp, and the thoughts "like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

"Why Mary," replied the father quietly, "you are getting more eloquent than the preacher, and a little extravagant in your praise.—What was the greatest excellence of the sermon?"

All excellent, father; first, the text—Solomon's Song, iv. 15, *A fountain of gardens, a well of living waters, and streams from Lebanon, Is not that beautiful?* Then he described a flower garden, with a jet d'eau in its center, throwing its silvery spray over the plants; and the streams from Mt. Lebanon, now leaping in cascades, now sleeping in cool basins, and now laying their silver threads across the fertile plains! Such a garden, he said, reminded him of the Garden of Eden, watered by the river of God; such a fountain, of the depths of his overflowing goodness; and such streams, of the multiplied channels of his love!

And then, he remarked, that garden is an emblem of Heaven! That fountain an emblem of the head-spring of salvation! And those streams emblematical of the streams which unite in the river of life!

And having lifted us to heaven, he kept us there half an hour, beholding its beauties, and listening to its songs. And when we came down by the "Milky Way," he explained that to be the jeweled sash which girds the shoulder and loins of the Almighty; the moon to be but the sapphire pavement for his feet; the sun the

radiant glory of his brow; lightning the flash of his eye, and thunder but the whisper of his voice! Wasn't it a splendid sermon?"

"My daughter, the preacher ran away with your fancy, and in the flight you lost your usual good sense. His was the responsible duty of preaching the Gospel, but he has given you a compound of poetry, natural scenery, and fancy. What doctrine did he derive from the text?—What duty enjoin? What did he make of it beyond a bridle-post for his imagination? The great business of a preacher is not to amuse, but to instruct, impress, and persuade his hearers to lay hold on eternal life. Christianity does not reject ornament. Jesus drew lessons from the lilies of the field, the clusters of the vine, and the crimson glow of the sky. So may the preacher for the same purpose—to impress truth and duty. But saving men with sermons composed of rhetorical flowers and poetical fancies, is like keeping them from starvation with the painted bread and fruit of the canvass which hangs on the wall.

A person on hearing such a preacher with equal force and justice, remarked, "He snowed on the congregation; he snowed on them beautifully."

How many such sermons, do you suppose, it would take to awaken one sleepy conscience, and convert one sinner from the error of his ways? Could that sermon you call so eloquent, multiplied by a thousand, ever have reached the heart of our neighbor Roscoe? You remember his was a hard case. At first he refused to go even into a school-house to hear a sermon, and was not persuaded till I promised him a bushel of wheat, if the preacher did not tell him the most wonderful story he ever heard. It was that story—the story of the cross—that went to his heart. And now for eighteen months he has been a praying, godly man.

The poet speaks beautifully—

"Tis when the cross is preached,
And only then,
That from the pulpit
A mysterious power goes forth,
To renovate the mortal man."

Away, then, with Christless sermons. Let the hungry and thirsty have the bread and water of life. And away with that pulpit eloquence which flashes like the Northern light on a polar sky, but sends no flaming bolt to the sinner's heart. And, Mary, go to the Sermon on the Mount for a specimen of real eloquence, and to the feet of Him who preached it, for pardon in having sacrificed your good sense on the altar of fancy."

J. S.

From the Christian Teacher.

Inconsistencies.

You profess my sister, to be a disciple of Christ. What does that mean? Why, you answer, disciple means a learner. Then you profess to be a learner of Christ. But do you really learn of him? If so, when, and how? You cannot, like Mary, the sister of Lazarus, sit at his feet and take lessons from his divine lips. Would you, if you could? Let us see. There is a Book called the New Testament, containing an account of what he said, and what he did. Do you read it, my sister? Do you study that Book, and learn of him? How many lessons do you learn in a day? in a week? in a month? Will every dear sister who reads this, answer these questions to herself, and to her God?

You do not like to be called inconsistent. No one does. But if you claim to be a disciple of Christ, and never learn, or even try to learn a lesson of him, I ask you, are you not inconsistent? If, then, my sister, you do not wish to be called inconsistent, do not be inconsistent.

But, if you do not read the Scriptures, you do attend the Lord's Day meetings, and hear them read and commented on? Well, no. I have not attended the meetings lately, I must confess. But does not Christ's law make it your duty to meet with your brethren and sisters, to engage with them in his worship? Perhaps it does—but—but—I have good reasons for not going. Then you have good reasons for not obeying Christ! Nay my sister, say not so, I pray you! You have no good reasons for not obeying him! You can have no such reasons! I do not want to hear what you call your reasons. I have heard, and heard of too many of them. They make me sick, sick at heart, to know that a professed disciple of Christ would offer such reasons. *Reasons! Mercy on us! reasons!!* Why, the *Evil One*, himself, would laugh at the idea of your calling your pitiful excuses, *reasons*.

But while he laughs, there are those, my sister, who weep tears of bitter sorrow. There are those, who, with anguished bosoms, bow in secret, and beseech Him whom you profess to love and serve, but whom you thus dishonor, saying, "Lord, lay not this sin to her charge." If angels hovered near, and looked on with delight when in faith and penitence you gave

yourself to Christ, surely, when they take a survey of your present conduct, and listen to the *reasons*, they will spread their golden pinions, and sadly and slowly take their leave of one so lost to all that is good, and true, and lovely in the Christian character.

You know, my sister, the reasons, or rather the excuses you are wont to offer for thus disobeying your Savior. I need not, and I will not mention them here. I should be ashamed to see them in print; and so, I trust, would you. Your conduct is inconsistent with your profession, my sister, manifestly so. Repent! least your Savior disown you, and discard you forever from his presence and his glory.

You profess, my brother, to be a Christian. What does that mean? You answer me—a Christian means a follower of Christ. Then you profess to be a follower of Christ. Well, where do you follow him to? Do you follow him to the drinking saloon? He never *went* there.—Do you follow him to the billiard table? He never *went* there. Do you follow him to the card table? He never *went* there. Then if you go to those places, my brother, you are inconsistent.

He went to his Father in prayer. Do *you* do so? If not, you are inconsistent. He went about, doing good. Do *you* do so? He loved his enemies. Do *you* do so? He prayed for them that persecuted him, reviled him, murdered him. Do *you* do so? If not, again I say, you are inconsistent.

He gave his time, his energies, his labors, his life, for the salvation of the world. How much do *you* give? How *much*, my dear brother?—He sacrificed riches, honor, glory, peace, comfort, all he had, for you and me, and for our guilty race. How much do *you* sacrifice? *How much?*

He loved his disciples, yea, even unto death! He called them his *friends*—his *brethren*. He commanded them to love one another; to relieve each other's wants; to seek each other's good and happiness. He even declared that whatever mercy, or kindness, or charity should be shown by one disciple to another, would be acknowledged by Him, as shown to Himself.—"Inasmuch as ye have done it to one of the least of these, *my brethren*, ye have done it unto *me*."

Now, my dear brother, how is it with you? Do you love your brethren with that gentle, tender, abiding love which He has enjoined,

both by his precepts and his example? If a young gentleman loves a young lady, he seeks her society; if a husband loves his wife, he hurries home to meet her, so soon as his duties abroad will permit. Mark those little ones, "waiting for Pa;" how swift their feet, how bright their eyes, how full of joy their little hearts as they run to meet him, and to receive his heart-warm kiss! Do you thus seek the society of your brethren? Do you thus take delight in their company? Do you thus meet them with joy, and greet them with pleasure at your Father's house?

Ah! my brother, you go not there to meet them. I have been there many and many a time, hoping, longing to meet and greet you there; but I met you not. At first I feared you were sick. I inquired, but Bro. A. saw you Saturday night at the Theater. No, you were not sick. I inquired again, the next Lord's Day. Bro. B. saw you the night before at the Lodge. You and your family were well. The next Lord's Day morning I called to see you.—I asked *you* the cause of your not attending the meetings of the brethren. You, too, "began to make excuses." Shall I repeat your excuses here? Shall I print them, and send them abroad to be known and read of all men? Nay, my brother, nay! For your credit's sake, and mine; for the honor of the Christian family of which you claim to be a member, I will not, *can not* publish your *miserable* excuses. I would rather, like the sons of Noah, go backward, and throw a vail over them, than thus to expose your nakedness.

Perhaps I am over scrupulous. Perhaps such trifling and such triflers with sacred things, *ought* to be exposed. It may be due to Christ and his cause, that it should be done. But I forbear, at least, for the present. If I err, let me err on the side of mercy. "Vengeance is *mine*: I will repay, saith the Lord."

One thing I will say to all such brethren and sisters. Be consistent, I pray you! Either throw away those "lame and impotent" excuses, and do your duty as disciples of Christ, as Christians, or come out like men and women, and openly declare that you are no longer of Christ. Let not the Church-roll be longer disgraced with your names. Let not the cause of Christ be longer dishonored by your professed connection with it.

Beloved brethren and sisters: you who love Christ more than the world, and who are

"giving all diligence to make your calling and election sure;" to you I would address myself. Let me hail you as fellow pilgrims to "the Promised Land." The mountains of difficulty which loom up before you may seem steep and high. Let me point you to "the recompense of the reward" which lies beyond. Toil on, and toil ~~up~~ the rugged ascent. The summit once gained, then bursts upon your sight the grandest view ever given to mortal vision.—Then spreads out before you, "dressed in living green," the heavenly Canaan—your everlasting home.

"Heaven, heaven is a blessed region.

All, all, unity share;

Sweet, sweet are their endearments,

Hatred their hearts never bear;

Love love, love, love,

Pure and immortal is there."

Work it out Yourself.

We find among Christians those who are but partially enlightened, and who think that they have Christian experiences and Christian graces for the asking.

Suppose I should pray, "Lord God, give me a quick sense of the beauties of literature;" what would God say to me, if He said anything? "Fool, read on." I should be turned back to my books, and kept at them, till, after I had exercised my judgment and taste, and schooled myself in the matters of which they treated, and become familiar with them, I should become a literary critic.

Suppose I should go to God and say, "Lord, teach me to see the fine lines of a ship?" I remember, years ago, hearing people talk of the fine lines of ships, and looking to see them. I could not see any lines at all, and said.

"What lines do you mean?"

"Why the curves," said they. Do you not see how beautiful the bow is?"

I could not see a thing with my unpracticed eye. But now, after eighteen years familiarity with ships, I can see the finest lines, the most delicate curves. But ability to do this I could not have had for the asking.

A man goes and asks God to give him patience, and thinks God will teach him, and say, "Be thou patient." No, God will not. The man will go home, and his wife will say to him, "What a fool you have made of yourself!" and he will begin to fire up; but instantly he will

nenhink himself and say, "Stop! Stop! God is going to give you patience," and he will take a long breath and hold his peace. And the children will crowd around him, and climb upon him, and ply him with questions, and importune him for favors, without any consciousness that he is over-burdened, and he will start to push them away, but he will call to mind his prayer, and say, "I asked God to give me patience, and here is an opportunity to practice it," In short he will work out his own patience, if God answers his prayer—and God does answer our prayers. But how does he answer them? *By working in us to will and to do His own good pleasure.*

And so it is with every Christian grace. You cannot pray humility into yourselves. There is not a single Christian grace that you can acquire except in accordance with the great law of God that you are to have what you can earn. You cannot go to God with any probability of having your request granted, and say, "Lord, give me these needed things," in any spirit but this:—"Put me in the way of earning them according to the law by which they are always to be had."

New Invention.

Mr. James C. Rucker, from his knowledge of the geography, number of inhabitants etc., of "Jerusalem, Judea, and the region round about Jordan," and with the aid of a little mental arithmetic, has arrived at the sage conclusion that John *could not*, in the brief space of time which his ministry lasted, immerse so many.—Or, in other words, that they were *not* baptized of John in Jordan.—"Well," says the reader, "what of that? We have heard the same objection urged by those who do not believe the words of the New Testament, a score of times." Foreseeing, perhaps, that this kind of reasoning would not only preclude the idea of immersion, but, would forever cut off

sprinkling as practiced by his church—the Methodist Episcopal—with its two or three pages of "Then shall the Minister say," etc., and determined to save sprinkling at all hazards, whether he can save the practice of his church or not, he invents a remedy. He places John on the banks of the Jordan, surrounded by the vast multitude with upturned faces looking towards him; then he places in the hands of the Baptist a *long pole*,—a reed—with a sponge made fast to the end of it. Now, the Baptist dips his sponge into the water—now he raises it gently out of the water—now he adjusts it properly—now with an herculean effort, he swings his pole, and

"'Tis done!

The great transaction's done!!"

"Five hundred" are sprinkled at a single swing of this mighty pole.

We do not know whether Mr. Rucker has patented his *invention* or not, but, if he has not done so, we would advise him not to incur the expense, as it is entirely unnecessary—no one but him will ever think of making, using, or vending such silly stuff.

Mr. Rucker, how is this? Do you claim to have any authority for this kind of preaching; or are we to attribute it to the *depravity* of the human heart?

Gentle reader, do not become startled at this announcement. This kind of preaching is being done in the later half of the nineteenth century and within three miles of the geographical centre of the state of Illinois. And if it is denied by Mr. R., or his friends, we are ready to

prove it by living witnesses.

Brethren, let us awake from our lethargy and with all our powers proclaim to the people the living word of the living God; the Gospel; the power of God to the salvation of men; and, if possible be the means of saving the people from the effects of such preaching. K.

Prayers not pleasant to hear.

SELECTED BY MRS. J. J. MILES.

I do not like to hear him pray,
On bended knee—about an hour,
For grace to spend aright each day,
Who knows his neighbor has no flour.

I'd rather see him go to mill,
And buy his luckless neighbor bread,
And see his children eat their fill,
And laugh beneath their humble shed.

I do not like to hear him pray,
"Let blessings on the widow be"—
Who never seeks her home to say,
"If want o'ertakes you, come to me."

I hate the prayer, so loud and long,
That's uttered for the orphan's weal,
By him who sees them crushed by wrong,
And only with the lips can feel.

I do not like to hear her pray,
With Jeweled ears and silken dress,
Whose washer-woman toils all day,
And then, is asked to work for less.

Such pious shavers I despise—
With folded hands and air demure,
They lift to heav'n their holy eyes,
Then steal the earnings of the poor.

I do not like such soulless prayers—
If wrong, I hope to be forgiven.
No angel wing them upward bears,
They're lost a million miles from heaven.

Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of all thine increase: So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine.—SOLOMON.

A Dialogue—With a Moral.

Farmer.—Good morning Mr. M—
I wish you would be kind enough to grind my ax for me this morning, while I run up town and do a little business.

Mechanic.—I wish you would stay and turn the grind-stone. It is rather expensive to work for nothing and hire a boy to help.

MORAL.

If "very truly yours" would send a subscriber occasionally with his *private advertisement*, which he wishes inserted in "Your very excellent paper," it would materially assist in buying the paper on which his *gratuitous* advertising is done. If he would subscribe for it *himself*, it would add much to the fervency of his "May the Lord help you." K.

To the Brethren and Churches of Christ, in Illinois.

DEAR BRETHREN:—The Anniversary of our Missionary Society is fast approaching, and the hand of time will soon mark the close of another year's labor, a year which has been fraught with interesting events to all the lovers of God and humanity.

We have been passing through a *dark night*, and thousands of cheeks have been moistened with the tear of sadness and disappointment, but now, the *new day of Peace* is bursting upon us, in all its effulgence. Temporal and Spiritual blessings are being showered upon us. "*Liberally receive! Liberally give!!*"

The approach of our Anniversary

incites us to remember the following facts. We assemble at Springfield, at 10 o'clock A. M., on Wednesday August 30th, for the purpose of recounting our labors and talking of the goodness of our *Great King*. It is desirable that every congregation in the State be represented.

An effort will be made to get half-fare tickets on the Railroads for all who are in attendance.

Dear Brethren, the good work *can* not go on without money, and, therefore, we appeal to you, with confidence, in behalf of the Mission. — Will you not take up a collection for this purpose and forward to me at Springfield, Ill., (care of R. LATHAM,) immediately, with the annexed blank filled. Give notice of the collection one week in advance, and urge the importance of the work. Be sure to send delegates to the meeting. Do not *forget* or *neglect* to fill the blanks, and forward immediately, as I wish to embody them in my report for publication.

No matter how small or how great the offering, send immediately, and it will be credited and wisely used—and we ask our brethren when they make their offering, to remember us before God.

Yours in the love of the Truth,
A. H. RICE,
Cor. Sec.

DEAR BROTHER:—*I commit this circular, with the subjoined blank, to you, believing that you will attend to the matter promptly. Read the circular publicly.*

Please give all the items, and write plainly with ink. Fraternally, A. H. R.

Statistics.

Name of Church,
Name of Post Office,

Number of additions during the year,
Present number of members,
Names and address of Elders,
Name and address of Preacher,
Have you a Sunday School?
What is the number in attendance? .

Iowa Annual Meeting.

The Disciples of Christ in Iowa will convene in Annual State Meeting, in the city of Oskaloosa, at 2 o'clock, on Thursday before the 4th Lord's day in August.

Bro. A. D. Fillmore will be with us at this meeting. He will give lessons to teachers and leaders of church singing for one week before the meeting.

Come up, brethren, from all parts of the State, for we shall have a good time.

F. WALDEN.

Cor. Sec.

COMMENTARY ON REVELATIONS.—

Protracted sickness, two deaths, and the attendant expenses, force Bro. Padon to suspend the publication of the "Commentator," and, to gratify the expressed wish of many brethren, Bro. Padon will furnish for the pages of the PROCLAMATION the remainder of that work, commencing with the vii. Chapter. Will our exchanges please copy.

North-Western Christian Proclamation

Clayton Illinois, }
July, 6th, 1865. }

BROTHER DOWNS:

Very Dear Sir—

Though silent these months, I often

think of you and hope I am not forgotten by one whom I remember with so much pleasure.

After a weary and laborious campaign of twelve months constant preaching, I have determined to locate at Lincoln, Ills., which will be my P. O. in future.

If you will insert this short letter in your next issue, so that brethren who desire to have me hold protracted meetings for them may know where to address me, you will much oblige, dear Sir, your warm friend and brother,

WM. S. SPEER.

Vocal Music.

BRO. FILLMORE expects to attend the State meeting in Iowa, the last week in August, and during the preceding week, will give instruction in Vocal Music, at Oskaloosa.

It is expected that many of the Churches will send up their Preachers, their leading singers, and all who are or ought to be Teachers among them.

Brethren of Iowa, do not let Bro. Fillmore's visit be in any degree a failure. Go to Oskaloosa a week before the meeting and avail yourselves of the benefit of his instruction. The charms of music are known to all, and, perhaps, good congregational singing has more charms for the masses than any other music of this age. In this we can never be eminently successful without proper cultivation—without training. Brother Fillmore knows how to give this training.

K.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Home, Edger Co., Ill }
July, 20th, 1865. }

Brethren Downs and Karr:

A few weeks only has elapsed, since I wrote you last. But having a few leisure moments, I have concluded to spend them dropping you another scroll. On this day one week ago, I returned from a meeting held in Muddy-point congregation, in a little village called Johnstown, which only continued three and a half days; during which, we had to encounter the presiding Elder of the United Brethren Church, whose name is Mills, together with a circuit preacher of the same order. They had sent their appointment to our Meeting House for the same time.—We proposed preaching alternately, each occupying half the time, to which they at first consented. Elder Mills led out on Saturday at eleven, and I spoke at three, from the same chapter in the Hebrew letter, and remarked, during my discourse, that Christ did not, as many supposed, enter into his priesthood, when he was baptized of John in Jordan, nor until he was crucified, had shed his blood and ascended to heaven. When I closed, he arose and said he was one of those unfortunate ones who believed that his baptism introduced him into his priestly office. He spoke some time, but gave us no proof, but, I suppose, thought we ought to believe his assertion, because he was an Elder, presiding over eight counties. I still persisted in calling for proof, and when he could give none, I gave my coun-

ter evidence, which you know was not scarce, to which he made no reply, and that ended the first day of our Union Meeting.

Well, on the next morning, they withdrew into a school house just across the street, about four rods distant, and commenced operations there saying they had business enough to consume all the time. So our meeting progressed. But there being school in their house on Monday, they announced to their congregation that, on Monday at 10, o'clock, they would again occupy our house, without consulting us on the subject. So, we having an appointment at the same hour, we were again thrown together. It was then my turn to speak first, which I did from 1st, verse of 3d, chapter of Colossians. When I closed, I invited him to take the stand if he had any remarks to make. He arose, and said I denied baptism, having come in the room of circumcision, had also denied that Christians were now baptized with the Holy Spirit, and that I denied any Christian being baptized in water, in the days of the Apostles, and that baptism was not for Christians, but in order to become Christians, to all of which he objected. We then spoke some two or three times each, taking all the time we wished; but he still seemed to think, if he had time, he could convince the audience that he was right. I then proposed that we should meet again in the evening, and continue our investigations, till all were satisfied. He said he would gladly do so, but that he was obliged to return home that evening; so I agreed to excuse him; and strange to

tell, as soon as the congregation was dismissed, he made an appointment for 4 o'clock, back in the School House again. We continued our meeting the next day, and closed with nine additions; four immersed; three restored; and two by relation. Bro. Robert R. Pearey, and the two Bro's. Campbell, were with us and assisted with their songs, prayers, exhortations &c. Thus you see that the war is not yet over, in our ends of the earth; there is occasionally a battle to be fought. Then, Brethren, let us not lay aside the armor, but, sword in hand, contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and victory is certain at last. But let us not forget that Christianity is practical as well as theoretical. Combine the two and all is safe.

Bro. Karr, I reported a meeting which I held in April, at Cochran's Grove Congregation, in Shelby County, which continued eleven or twelve days, and closed with thirty nine or forty additions, mostly by confession and baptism, which has not been published, whether intentional or unintentional, I know not, neither does it matter; only, this being an old congregation, the brethren wished the brotherhood generally, to know how they were getting along; and that they are resolved, God helping, to stand firm, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord. There are many good brethren there, and sisters not a few. When we began our meeting, they numbered about one hundred and ninety; and when our meeting closed, two hundred and thirty were on their list. May God still prosper, shield, preserve and

protect them unto his eternal kingdom, in the use of all the means which he has ordained for the building up of his cause and kingdom in the world, and for the salvation of fallen humanity, is my prayer.

THOMAS GOODMAN.

—:—o—:—

Woodland, Cal.,
June 1st, 1865.

DEAR BRETHREN DOWNS AND KAER:—

One year has fled and gone since my arrival on this coast. My time has been spent in the Master's cause. Although I have not done much, I thank the Lord and take courage.— It is very hard to proselyte here, when compared with Illinois. But, it is our duty to preach—do what we can, and leave the result with the Lord. Near one half of my time has been devoted in trying to build up the cause in Sacramento city. Some good has been accomplished. The remainder of the time I have been Evangelizing.

Number of additions by confession and immersion, and otherwise, ninety six. One Church organized.

The "Christian Herald" is a welcome visitor. Its pages are freighted with good news. Go on in your good work, and may we all be saved in the everlasting kingdom.

J. W. GRAYCROFT.

:—o—o—o—o—o—o—:

Cameron. May 25th, 1865.

BROS. DOWNS AND KAER:—

I held a meeting in Mercer County, with the congregation at Eliza Creek, commencing in the last week of April and continuing over two Lord's days. One immersed.— The Brethren were greatly encouraged.

I Commenced a meeting at Oak Ridge, Mercer County, Thursday before the second Lord's day in May.— Organized a congregation, on the third Lord's day, with fifteen members, all heads of families, male and female, save one. Meeting still in progress. Brother Harlin was with me six days. Prospects good for many additions.

Yours in the Christian's hope.

ELI FISHER.

—:—oo—:—

Deep River, Poweshiek Co., Iowa.

BROTHERS DOWNS AND KAER:

You may say to the brethren, through your paper, that I commenced a meeting on Saturday morning before the second Lord's day in June, on the banks of the Deep River.

Bro. Springer came on Saturday evening, and preached four discourses for us until he made the woods resound with the old gospel trumpet, at which time we had six additions, four by confession and baptism, two from the United Brethren, and two by letter. It is supposed that he preached to about one thousand people. Bro. Springer is a workman that we are not ashamed of. May the Lord bless him in all of his works.

Your Brother in Christ,

G. T. JOHNSON.

—o—o—

Charleston, Illinois, }
June, 27th, 1865. }

DEAR BROTHER DOWNS:

Last Lord's day, I preached on Deer Creek. The immediate result was, three noble souls made the good Confession and were buried with their Lord in holy baptism. Two of them

were men with large families. Some of their families I immersed over a year ago. I had quit preaching on Deer Creek, for a good while, and they were so determined to have me go back that I sent the appointment, and rejoice that it has not been in vain. May the good Lord keep us from all harm.

Your Brother in Christ,

HARMON GREGG.

Cameron, Illinois, }
July 20th, 1865. }

DEAR CHRISTIAN HERALD:

The second Lord's day in July, I visited Bedford congregation, where I met Bro. Featherston. Each of us preached a discourse. Three persons were added—two by letter, one by immersion.

Saturday evening before the third Lord's day, I commenced a meeting at Oak Ridge, Mercer, Co. Preached three discourses. One was added by commendation.

The Lord is blessing our labors.

ELI FISHER.

At a meeting recently held, at Barngrover's, a congregation was organized. One individual, a gray haired man, confessed his faith in Jesus as the Christ the Son of the living God, and was baptized into Him.

* *

Sweeney and Logan Debate.

This debate took place in Whitehall Ill., between Bro. J. S. Sweeney and Mr. J. B. Logan, Cumberland Presbyterian, and editor of a paper of the same name published at Alton.

It was conducted with ability on both sides, and is regarded by some of our most experienced brethren as the ablest discussion of the questions at issue, ever published in this country. They discussed the Subject, Action, and Design of baptism, and Infant regeneration. Let all who want it send for it immediately, as the first edition is well-nigh exhausted. If you want a work in which truth is ably and successfully defended, and error unmasked, exposed and exploded, send to J. S. Sweeney, Box 1826, Chicago, Ill., for this debate. Price \$1.00. D.

OUR TABLE.

T. S. PIERSOL, Salem, Iowa.—Your money came. You are credited to Dec. next. Your paper is now sent to Salem. We send the missing number again. The books were sent as you ordered.

Owing to Bro. Downs' being engaged in a meeting at Golconda, his "Church of Christ, No. 4," was not prepared in time for this number.—It will appear in the next issue. We hope our readers will feel compensated for the delay, when they learn the fact, that he is engaged in a successful effort to establish the cause in that place.

To OLD SUBSCRIBERS:—Some misunderstanding exists on the part of some, as to what we propose to do in the case of those who subscribed for *The Herald* last year. We will try to explain. When we began, we expected to publish at one dollar a year, but after several month's expe

rience, we found that we could not afford it. To those who had subscribed, and *paid* one dollar, for the paper for one year, we were under obligation to furnish it at that price, and, after having sent them seven numbers last year, we sent them *five* numbers of the present volume, to close our contract. Those who began with the June number were credited to May of this year, and, hence, their time was out with the last number. By this arrangement we lose a few cents on each subscription, but we prefer to do this, rather than to *break* the contract, by sending the paper for a less time than it had been paid for, or to ask our subscribers to pay more.

Several hundred subscriptions expired with the last number. Of these only a few, comparatively, have renewed, owing, perhaps, to the fact that we failed to notify in due time. We shall send this number to most of our former patrons, and we ask those who have only paid one dollar, to remember that their time was out last month, and to renew immediately by sending us two dollars for another year, or one dollar and twenty cents to the close of this year. If any do not wish to continue to take the paper, they will please to return this number to us without delay.— Thus far, we have heard of only three who wish to part company with us. Two of them were subscribers; the other, a sister to whom we have been furnishing it *gratuitously*.

We should esteem it a favor if our patrons would, in renewing, call the attention of their friends to the matter and send us as many new subscri-

bers as they can. We will allow each subscriber to retain 25cts, on each new subscription they send us for the *current volume*, as some remuneration for their trouble.

PREMIUMS;— Let those brethren and sisters who are entitled to premiums for having sent us 25 subscribers, apply for them, giving the names of subscribers sent. As we do not keep an account of the number sent by each, we can not always tell who are entitled to premiums; hence, you may not get them without making the application.

It is not yet too late to compete for these premiums. By a very little effort, you can get the requisite number of subscribers, to entitle you to a valuable book, and at the same time put a nice Parlor Magazine—a good Religious Periodical into the hands of your neighbors. Try it!

CONTENTS.

The Law of Life,	161
Epistle to the Hebrews,	170
The Greatest Error,	171
Reporting,	175
Letter from Bro. Harriott,	176
Query,	178
Indeed,	180
That Sermon,	182
Inconsistencies,	183
Work it out Yourself,	184
New Invention,	185
Poetry,	186
Dialogue—With a Moral,	186
Illinois State Meeting,	186
Iowa State Meeting,	187
Padon's Lectures,	187
Correspondence,	188
Our Table,	191

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1876.

I.—THE PREACHER'S NEED OF MENTAL AND MORAL
SCIENCE.

"Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man ; for he knew what was in man."—JOHN ii, 23-25.

NO other teacher has touched so many chords in the human soul as Jesus of Nazareth. No other has struck the chords that he has touched, with such power. Innumerable are the intellects that he has stimulated to activity, the consciences that he has quickened, the wills that he has strung with high resolve, the fountains of affection that he has opened, and the streams of sympathy that he has caused to flow. His influence, beginning with his first utterances as a teacher, has continued to increase, and, in widening circles, is now passing to the confines of the world.

We may well inquire, What is the explanation of this power so pervasive and so permanent? Adequately to answer, one must sum up all the elements of Jesus' nature and life. It meets the present purpose to say, "He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man ; for he knew what was in man." A condition of the power of his appeals to man, is his knowledge of man. How many are the evidences of this power found in the Gospels! These

writings abound with such passages as these: "Jesus knew their thoughts;"* "He knew who should betray him."† What is more, his words show that he possessed this knowledge. What pertinency in his questions and answers! What opportuneness in his lessons! His word is now a rebuke, now a maxim, now a probe to the conscience, and then again a beatitude, a warning, a parable, or a prophecy, according to what is needed. "The common people hear him gladly;"‡ the policemen sent to arrest him return saying, "Never man spake like this man;"§ while all wonder at the gracious words that proceed out of his mouth. No other teacher has so fully illustrated the proverb, "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver." Certainly, "he needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man."

Now, if the Great Teacher could not have done his work without knowing men, we may be very sure that the minister of his religion can not do his work without some of the same knowledge. It is hardly too much to say, the greater the preacher's knowledge of men, the greater will be his influence and usefulness. Without such knowledge how can he be prepared to instruct and move those who wait on his ministry? How shall he convict men of sin, and lay the basis of faith? How shall he know when to arouse, and when to soothe; when to alarm the conscience, and when to appeal to the affections or the fancy? The preacher must have a knowledge of the human soul, or be a bungler in his calling; and when he acquires this knowledge, he is cultivating the field of mental and moral science.

I. THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM AND THE SOUL.

In the first place, I shall argue the preacher's need of the mental and moral sciences from the correlation of the Christian system to the human mind. The elaboration of this argument requires that both the mind and this system shall be mapped out. Let me premise, however, that, for the most part, I must speak dogmatically, withholding the arguments upon which my propositions rest. Even in handling controverted points, I must avoid controversy, since time will not admit of such discussion. This is the less necessary from the fact that I am not here a teacher of psychology and ethics; my

* Matthew xii, 25.

† John xiii, 11.

‡ Mark xii, 37.

§ John vii, 46.

business is to show the preacher's need of these sciences; and the value of the discussion, if it have any, will be independent of particular views that may be advanced. You may prove incontestably that a statesman should understand political economy, and yet your own views of taxation and the currency may be wholly wrong.

Man may be divided into two parts—matter and spirit, body and mind. He is not two natures, but one nature; not two beings, but one being: said nature, or being, consisting of a physical and a non-physical part. These parts pass into each other, so that we can not practically separate the one from the other; but they may be, and must be, separated for many of the purposes of thought. As the sciences of the mind deal with the body only so far as that is correlated with the mind, we may dismiss it from further consideration. The mind is generally divided into the intellect, the sensibility, and the will. The intellect is lowest, and conditions the sensibility; while the sensibility, thus conditioned, itself conditions the will. These faculties yield as results knowledge or cognition, feeling (under the two genera of pleasure and pain), and choice. Accordingly, the mind, or soul, or spirit (for the terms are interchangeable), exerts three kinds of activity—it knows, it feels, it chooses. Originally propounded by Kant, in the “*Critique of the Judgment*,” this division has been almost universally adopted by those writers who believe in mental faculties at all. Sir William Hamilton illustrates the nature and correlation of the three activities by a common example. Before quoting the passage, however, let me add that Hamilton adds desire to will, under the third head:

“I see a picture. Now, first of all, I am conscious of perceiving a certain complement of colors and figures; I recognize what the object is. This is the phenomenon of cognition, or knowledge. But this is not the only phenomenon of which I may be here conscious. I may experience certain affections in the contemplation of this object. If the picture be a masterpiece, the gratification will be unalloyed; but if it be an unequal production, I shall be conscious, perhaps, of enjoyment, but of enjoyment alloyed with dissatisfaction. This is the phenomenon of feeling—or of pleasure and pain. But these two phenomena do not yet exhaust all of which I may be conscious on the occasion. I may desire to see the picture long, to see it often, to make it my own; and perhaps I may will, resolve, or determine so to do. This is the complex phenomenon of will and desire.”*

The intellect, or knowing faculty, is capable of division. Different divisions have been propounded, but we will follow the one that

* “*Metaphysics*,” Lecture XI.

makes four species—the intuitive, presentative, representative, and elaborative faculties. Their products are intuitive, presentative, representative, and thought knowledge.

The power, or faculty, of intuition gives what are called the intuitions. Here belong the ideas of being, space, time, and causation, as well as proper axioms. "All our knowledge," says Kant, "begins with experience, but not all knowledge springs from experience." He excepts the class of ideas just named. "They are not born in us," says Dr. Hopkins; "but as we are born with eyes, so that, when the occasion is given, we see, so we are born with a capacity of forming these ideas, so that, when the occasion is given, we form them of necessity."* Hence, they are not formed by analysis and comparison; they are conditioned, but not caused, by experience. These ideas are called universal, because all men have them; necessary, because we can not think of man's being without them; *a priori*, because not caused by experience; rational, as proceeding from what is called *the reason*; intuitive, because they are discovered by the mind's peering into itself; simple, because incapable of analysis. Hamilton called them regulative ideas, because they limit and control the action of the mind; all mental acts being within the field bounded by being, time, space, and causation. It is proper to add, that the intuitions are the subject of vehement dispute, some writers even denying that we have them. They do not deny that we have the ideas just mentioned, but they hold that they come from experience, through the medium of generalization.†

The second variety of knowledge is the presentative. This originates in the two kinds of perception, the outer and the inner; or, as they are sometimes called, sense-perception and self-consciousness. Sense-perception gives us all of our immediate knowledge of the external world; its avenues, as the name denotes, are the five senses. Our immediate knowledge of the earth, the air, the sky, the sea, of human society, even of our own bodies, is perceptive. Under the form of self-consciousness, perception reveals to us the world of the

* "Outline Study of Man," New York, 1874, p. 74.

† Almost all writers on mental science make intuition the last dividing member of the intellect. Dr. Hopkins, in his "Outline Study of Man," has very clearly shown that this arrangement is wrong. "As elemental and conditional for all mental action, and for the action of brutes as well as men, their office is low, just as that of gravitation is low." "They are first in the order of nature and are the lowest and most elemental; they are involved in all that come after, and are needed to explain them." (Pages 79, 83.)

soul. As we survey the outer world with the eye of the body, so we survey the inner world with the eye of the mind. In this way, we know the states and affections of the mind—its knowledge, its feelings, and its choices. The faculty that furnishes this knowledge is called the presentative, since it presents or exhibits knowledge to the intellect; it is also called the faculty of observation and of experience. The quantity of knowledge that it gives us is very great.

Next comes representation. This is the faculty that *re*-presents in consciousness (or in the mind) the knowledge first presented by perception. In the form of memory, it recalls and vivifies what was once known, but that, for a time, has been out of the mind. As fantasy, it revels in dreams and in castle-building. As imagination, it constructs ideals in commerce, in war, in statesmanship, in philanthropy, in poetry, and the other arts. In no one of its forms can it create new materials. It simply recalls and recombines what another faculty has furnished. Perhaps no other faculty of the intellect is so little understood by the common mind.

The last kind of knowledge is the elaborative, or thought. Its materials come from presentation, its forms from intuition. This faculty compares, judges, and generalizes. It forms concepts and judgments, and draws inferences. It is the arguing or reasoning faculty. Its field is truth rather than fact. Its instruments, or methods, are analogy, deduction, and induction. The presentative faculty gives us facts; the elaborative builds them up into sciences and philosophies. It is the highest exercise of the intellect, and is very properly called thinking; its product, thought.

This sketch must suffice for the intellect. We pass now to the sensibility.

The sensibility is the faculty of feeling; its field is the experience of pleasure and of pain. It may be said to be threefold: first, the physical sensibility, or the experience of physical pleasure and pain; second, the æsthetic sensibility, which ranges over the field of taste, the empire of beauty and deformity in nature and in art; last, the moral sensibility, through which we receive pleasure or pain from the actions of moral beings. Thus, every affection of the mind that can be called feeling is recognized by the sensibility. To be sure, the feelings are the objects of perception in self-consciousness; but, as such, they belong to the second great faculty of the mind. Without

this faculty, there could be no such thing as good, and therefore no idea of good. Hence, the sensibility is the faculty to which exhortation appeals. Arguments are for the intellect; motives, for the sensibility, and, through the sensibility, for the will. As intelligent only, man could perceive facts, outer and inner, could recall them by memory, and could build them into systems of knowledge by thought; but he could have no experience of pain or pleasure, no idea of ill or good. Had he intellect only, heaven and hell would, in point of feeling, be alike to him.

At last we reach the will, the monarch of the mind. This faculty is revealed under two powers, choice and volition—the power to elect, and the power to carry the election into effect. The first is spontaneous and free: it is the power that makes a man responsible. The intellect acts by necessary laws; so does the sensibility. Hence, there is no more moral quality in the intellect, or in the sensibility, as such, than there is in the combining of chemical elements, or in the evolution of a mathematical formula. But the will, acting as a choice, rises superior to necessary law, and binds man with the ties of obligation.

Man has only one mind, but this acts in three ways—it knows, it feels, it wills. It must not be supposed that these fields are closed to one another; in fact, they open into each other by numerous gateways; they interpenetrate and even overlap. The lower faculties are conditional for the higher. The soul rests on the body. The body reaches up through the action of the soul. The intellect conditions the feelings, and these again the will. As we rise in our study of man's nature, we must carry the lower powers with us to the higher. Knowledge flows into feeling, and the two into the will. In the language of Dr. Hopkins: "By the addition of the sensibility to the intellect, we have a new department for the intellect. The intellect gives us light simply; what has sometimes been called a 'dry light.' With the sensibility added, we have light and warmth blended, and a field for the intellect that covers the whole range of possible combinations of intellect and feeling where no conscious will or purpose is involved. With the will added, we have not only light and warmth, but the chemical rays. The action of will not only opens new fields to the intellect, but gives new materials and forms to the sensibility. It is here, and here only, that we find any thing of a moral character."*

*"Outline Study of Man," p. 248, 249.

Accordingly, many of the acts of the soul are highly complex and difficult of analysis; they are neither pure intellect, pure feeling, nor pure choice: hence, many of the difficulties of mental and moral science; hence, also, the intimate relationship of the two sciences. The science of certain mental states is Psychology; the science of certain others, Ethics; and, as the lower faculties condition the higher, so the study of mental science should precede moral. The student should never enter on morals, the science of duty,* until he has mastered psychology, the science of the intellect. Not only so, the products of the soul become more difficult of scientific treatment as we rise in the scale. Intuition, perception, memory, ratiocination, are pure intellect, and are understood with comparative ease; the ideas of good and beauty are mastered with more difficulty; and, when we reach such states as the moral affections and the religious emotions, we are dealing with matters still more difficult to understand. The nature and functions of conscience I can but think a harder problem than the nature and functions of consciousness; the one is an intellectual, the other a moral, state.

The human soul has now been mapped out in outline. Its greater divisions have been marked, and some of the minor ones also. Many of the latter have been passed over, for obvious reasons. Of the great divisions, the intellect has been most studied and most valued. At the same time, knowledge is the lowest product of the mind. Conscience is higher than consciousness; affection, than fact; choice, than thought. Concerning the comparative neglect of the sensibility and the will in our systems of education, I can not forbear quoting a passage from Dr. Hopkins, although it lies a little out of my path:

"It may, perhaps, seem strange to some that the intellect should be placed lowest, but it belongs there; and the order in which I have presented the different parts of our nature, presents, as I suppose, the order of the progress of the race when it has been reduced to a savage or semi-barbarous state, and would rise again. At first, men worship strength of body, physical energy. The man who had the greatest power of muscles was the hero. Even yet there are many with whom physical prowess is the great thing, and who hold those who manifest it in higher esteem than any others. The next step is the worship of intellect. Disputants and intellectual prize-fighters become heroes. Great debaters, pleaders, orators, writers, become the great men, irrespective of character. This is our present state. No nation has yet got beyond this. In our literary institutions it is chiefly the

* "The science that teaches men their duty, and the reasons of it," is Paley's definition of moral philosophy.

intellect that is educated, and in some of them more and more, with little or no systematic regard for the training of the higher powers. No doubt the time will come when this state of things will be looked back upon as we now look back on the ascendancy of physical force. Until the intellect is placed by the community where it belongs, and made subordinate to the sensibility and the will, we shall find that mere sharpness, shrewdness, intellectual power, and success through these, will be placed above those higher qualities in which *character* consists, and success through them. The intellect is simply instrumental, and belongs where I have placed it."*

A rapid outline of the Christian system will exhibit its correlation to the mind. There is not a faculty of the soul which has not its counterpart in Christianity. First of all, it is a body of doctrine, or a system of truth, and as such it appeals to the intellect. It is to be studied and learned like a science or a philosophy. It comes to man as historical and didactic knowledge. As history or doctrine, it appeals to perception and thought, calling them into vigorous activity; while no other body of teaching gives equal employment to the imagination, the highest form of representative knowledge. It also appeals to the sensibility. Without the sense of feeling, the promises and threatenings of the Gospel would make no impression on the mind. It also appeals to the will, giving man his best opportunity to exercise choice and volition. Its mandates are, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve;" "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." It appeals, too, to all the complex faculties. It sounds the conscience, convincing man of righteousness, of sin, and of judgment. It fills the sinner with alarm for his soul. It creates within him a dread of punishment and a desire for happiness. It arouses the affections, causing us to love Him who first loved us. In a word, no doctrine or faith has ever been preached to man that touches him at so many points. Science, both natural and mental, cultivates the intellect; moral philosophy analyzes the moral actions, and holds up the sanctions of the conscience; but it does not develop the power of religious faith, and its appeal to the will is comparatively cold and ineffectual. Moral philosophy is wanting in the love of Christ, the enthusiasm of humanity. It remains, therefore, for the Christian system to arouse every power,—to blend fact, thought, feeling, sentiment, and motive, into one complex whole, that stimulates every form of soul activity. The same comprehensiveness and variety mark the Biblical mode of teaching. Simple statement, logi-

* "Outline Study of Man," pp. 58, 59.

cal inference, parable, and allegory blend together. The strongest dogmatic teaching, the tenderest appeals, the sternest threatenings, are made to harmonize. That the author of human nature is also the author of the Bible, can be argued from the perfect correlation of the one to the other. Assuredly, if Coleridge is right when he says, "That is truth which finds me," Christianity must be true; for it finds us at a thousand points.

Such, roughly sketched, is the nature with which the preacher is to deal; and such, hastily outlined, is the system of truth which he is to handle. His work is to bring Christianity and the soul into relation, and he must do this so as to effect the largest results. He is to use the Bible as an instrument with which to discipline and culture men. He is to apply the most complex of systems to the most complex of natures. He must, therefore, have a profound knowledge both of the Bible and of the mind. While this proposition will be generally assented to so long as it is asserted in general terms, it will be very strongly objected to by some when it is defined to mean a training in the sciences of the mind. There is a class of men who will reason on this subject somewhat as follows:

"To teach men, you must know men, of course. The teacher must understand human nature in an experimental way; he must have a certain practical sagacity, or *tact*, in interpreting character; but this experimental knowledge, or practical tact, springs from knowledge of the world, rather than from an acquaintance with the sciences of the soul." In support of this view, it may be said: "Christ's knowledge of men was rather practical than scientific; he read men's thoughts, saw through their foibles, discerned their spirits."

To such reasoning it may be replied: "It is not without plausibility, and even force. A knowledge of man, in the common acceptation of the phrase, does not of necessity include knowledge of the mental and moral sciences; nor does a knowledge of these sciences always bring with it a practical knowledge of men. A man may handle men with great power, and know nothing of books on psychology and ethics; and he may be a mere novice in handling men, although immensely learned in such literature. After all, however, other things being equal, he will best succeed who has the best knowledge of the nature with which he deals. What is more, practical efficiency springs from knowledge. We talk about 'sagacity'

and 'tact,' as though they were innate powers. They are simply trained ability. Accordingly, he will best master his subject who studies it the most thoroughly and in the best way; and as the scientific is the best way to study a subject, it is more likely to lead to practical efficiency than the empirical. A man may practice land-surveying, and know nothing of geometry, if he can manipulate a chain and compass and apply a few formulæ. So he may sail a ship in entire ignorance of the science of navigation. But who would not prefer to put down his landmarks where a scientific surveyor said they should be placed; or to intrust his property—much more his life—to a sailor who knows his science as well as his art? One does not need to be a chemist or a physiologist to recommend bread as a wholesome article of food, or even to make it; but he will be the better physician for having some knowledge of chemistry and physiology.

"Again, Christ's knowledge of men, as we see it in the Gospel, is practical rather than theoretical; analogous to that which men evince in the affairs of life, though much more complete. Such knowledge is of great value to men. It tells a man when to speak, and when to keep silent; what to say, and what to withhold. But in Christ's mind it originated in a way very different from that in which it originates in our minds. His knowledge was like the knowledge of God. In accommodation to human modes of expression, God is said to see and to reason; but his knowledge is immediate, original, and intuitive. He never reaches conclusions by logical process; He knows all things by intuitive intelligence. Such is Christ's knowledge. Accordingly, he is said to have known 'from the beginning who they were who believed not, and who should betray him.'* This knowledge antedated experience and was independent of all data. How different is our knowledge! Our intuitions are few in number, and such as we have are awakened to life by experience. Almost all our knowledge comes from experience either immediately or mediately, by perception direct or by the way of reasoning. Man perceives phenomena, registers his observations, classifies his facts, and deduces from them, by a slow and painful process of inference, principles, and laws. In all the higher uses of the knowing faculties, he must return to the subject again and again, verifying his facts and testing his conclusions.

* John vi, 64.

And when he has finished his work and named the product *knowledge*, he is not blind to the fact that uncertainty enters into it more or less deeply. This is especially true of his knowledge of the mind. Nothing so eludes analysis as the manifestations of spirit; nothing is so impalpable as thought, feeling, and volition. This is why mental science is a vast field of controversy. Whatever we know of the mind, we know by observing the minds of others, by introspection, by analysis and verification, by patient induction. Accordingly, whenever we study it to any purpose, we are cultivating mental and moral science, whether we study it by immediate observation or through the medium of a book. Unlike Jesus, we do need 'that some one should testify of man.'"

Thus far we have been examining the correlation of Christianity to human nature in the broadest sense. Something must now be said concerning human nature as modified in particular individuals.

All men are built on what may be called the same general plan. They all have intellect, all sensibility, all will; all have consciousness, conscience, the natural and moral affections, and the religious emotions; all have intuitions, perceptive knowledge, memory, imagination, and thought; all have the ideas of pain and pleasure, of good and ill, of personality and responsibility. But two houses, very different, may be built on the same foundation, and even of the same materials. So it is with men. The world of man presents a variety equaled only by the variety of nature. No two individuals are exactly alike. One man is strong in intellect, but deficient in sensibility or in will; a second has a powerful sensibility, but is weak in one or both of the other faculties; a third has a cold imagination, but great argumentative power; a fourth has warm affections and quick generous impulses, but small sense of duty. One man will listen to argument, but can not be moved by exhortation; another will weep at some picture of distress, but, poor fellow, he can never see the logical relation of two propositions; still another will give money to a beggar, but leave his debts unpaid without sense of shame; a fourth is as just as Rhadamanthus, and as unfeeling. No man is full and strong at all points; at best, we are but fragments of men. Hence says Solomon, "Mark the perfect man." In short, if you should determine the number of spiritual qualities that enter into a man; if you should conceive of each of these as existing in a hundred different degrees of strength;

if you should multiply these two quantities together, and find the permutations of their product, you would not exhaust the possible types of men, and hardly exceed the real types. Now, if the perfect man should be brought into relation to Christianity, what would follow? He would be convinced by its facts, moved by its motives, stirred by its appeals to his conscience, and all with equal power. But how is it when the actual man is brought into such relation? He is acted upon with different degrees of power. His understanding may be convinced, but his feelings remain apathetic; he may have vivid conceptions of the New Jerusalem, but no sense of moral duty; he may weep at the story of the suffering Savior, but have no grasp of the Gospel as the wisdom of God; he may tremble at the threatenings of the Gospel, and flee the wrath to come, but have only a feeble hold on God as a Father. The fact is, men are bound to religion by different ties—one by reasoning, a second by love, a third by fear. Though men are acted upon by a variety of influences, few if any are acted upon by all influences in their full strength.

The bearing of the facts just stated on the work of a preacher is, or ought to be, obvious. In the first place, the evangelist must understand men in order that he may reach them. Provided he is equally master of all the elements of the Gospel, he will naturally use those that he can use to the best advantage. In preaching the Gospel, men must be individualized and differentiated, as children are in the family and in the school. The evangelist who approaches all men in the same way, who thinks there is only one kind of men, and acts accordingly, will have but indifferent success. Great powers of mind and great knowledge of the Scriptures can not overcome this defect. In the second place, successful pastoral labor rests on the same condition. That he may *teach* men, the pastor must *know* men—not man in his general character, but the very men he teaches. His business is to build up their natures, to make them full and strong in all points pertaining to morals and spirituality. His people are to grow in knowledge and in grace under his care. If the religion of some members of the congregation is logical and cold, the pastor must open up their sensibilities and affections; if others are highly emotional and impulsive, he must root and ground them in the facts and reasons of the Gospel; if others still are lacking in the ethical elements of religion, he must cultivate the sense of moral duty. Whether

an evangelist or a pastor, the preacher, to be highly successful, must touch every key in the organ of human nature.

Practically, however, the differences among men are not so important as they may seem. Although each one has his individual peculiarities, although John is John, James James, and neither Thomas, in nature as well as in name, still there are great groups or classes of men in which minor differences disappear. There is your matter-of-fact man, your sentimental man, your emotional man; that is, there is the man in whom one of these qualities is in the ascendancy, and whose character is described accordingly. And, certainly, if the preacher can not be fairly expected to know men by their individual peculiarities, as perhaps he can not be, it may be fairly demanded of him that he shall know them by their classes. He should be able to recognize the matter-of-fact man, the sentimental man, the emotional man, and know how to handle him.

Communities also have their characteristics. Different tones of mind are found in different places. A community's tone grows in part out of the inherited qualities of the people, and in part out of its general culture. A typical New England congregation demands logical precision and critical exactness in its teachers, but is rather indifferent, if not hostile, to warmth and color. The typical Southern or Western congregation, with its warmer feelings and more demonstrative manners, would freeze in the New England atmosphere. Then there are the traditional tones of thought, the special ways of seeing things, the local foibles and prejudices, that a preacher encounters. He is but a fool if he runs foul of these when he can avoid them. On Mars' Hill, Paul stood in the presence of an assembly, cultured, polite, with a habit of mind distinctly marked. What knowledge of men, what appreciation of his surroundings, what practical tact, what courtesy, in his address! He begins with saying, "You men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious" (not "too superstitious," as the common version makes him say). He then finds a point of contact between the Gospel that he preached and the heathenism that they practiced, in the inscription on the altar, "To the Unknown God." Him whom they had ignorantly worshiped, Paul boldly declares unto them. Having won their attention by his appreciation and politeness, he now saps the basis of their idolatry by proclaiming, that "God dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither

is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing ;" and of their materialism, by preaching the resurrection of the dead. In the sequel, some mock, certain cleave unto him and believe, while others promise, "We will hear thee again of this matter."* Would the apostle have succeeded better if he had actually called the Athenians "superstitious," and had denounced the temples on the Acropolis?

Among an ignorant and superstitious people, the priest may control men through fear and authority ; but the Christian teacher can not do so in any intelligent community. He must win men. Hence, he must know man in his general nature, and in his class and local characters. No man needs to have a mind more appreciative and many-sided. One great obstacle to the progress of Christianity in India is the profound philosophy of the cultivated Hindoos. We are so accustomed to regard the Hindoo as a pagan of darkened mind, that we overlook the fact of his having in his possession, handed down from the time of the Sanskrit theologians and poets, a metaphysics of remarkable subtlety and depth. How would Paul attempt to reach this people? Undoubtedly, by studying their mind, and seeking to discover some points of contact between their philosophy and the religion of Jesus. However it may be with the millions of India, I see no reason to expect that her scholars and thinkers will be converted to Christ, unless their culture shall be treated in some such appreciative and sympathetic manner.

Let me dismiss the first great branch of this argument with the remark, As well expect a man who has no knowledge of the science of music to play an organ of a hundred stops, as to expect him to bring the Bible and the soul into due relation who does not understand the nature of man.

II. BIBLICAL STUDY AND THE SCIENCES OF THE MIND.

The interpretation and systematization of the Bible rest on the mental and moral sciences. To a great degree, the Bible is historical ; even the non-historical books, as the Prophets and Epistles, abound in historical matter. What is more, the religious history of man, as traced in the Bible, runs parallel with his secular history, as traced in historical memorials. These facts constitute the reason why the student of the Bible should be a good historian. As a

* Acts xvii, 23-34.

part of general culture, history has its value for him as for other men; but there is a special reason why he should be familiar with its materials and results, as also with its methods. For a similar though less cogent reason, he should have some training in science. But he must not fail to be versed in the sciences of the mind. This I hasten to show from the nature of the Book with which he deals.

The Bible is a book of literary memorials, written in different ages, in different languages, and by different men. Granting that it proceeds from one source, it is still marked more or less deeply by the peculiarities of its human authors and by the circumstances under which it was written. It must be handled like other works that are similar in their external features. It calls for the literary sense. What are some of the qualities of the successful interpreter? Largeness of heart, many-sidedness, catholicity of spirit; that sympathetic quality which enables its possessor to transport himself into other scenes, and to appreciate other systems of culture than the one in which he was reared. What was the spirit of the patriarchal world? of the Jewish? of the Roman and the Greek? What is the angle of observation from which different books and passages are written? What was the feeling that John struck at when he said to the Pharisees and Sadducees, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father?"* What was the feeling lying in the minds of the Nazarenes, that caused them to be "offended" in Jesus?† These may be poor illustrations, but they will serve to show that, in interpreting Scripture, the stand-point of the one who asks and the one who answers, of preacher and audience, must be taken into the account. Particularly in the Gospels, but also in the other books, series of events move back of what appears on the surface; and the successful expositor must be able to read and to show what is "between the lines." The ability to meet these conditions comes in part from historical knowledge of the Jew, the Greek, and the Roman, and of their habits of mind; but more largely it comes from the power to get into men's minds, and vividly to reproduce what took place centuries ago, or what takes place now in remote places. To some extent, the power comes from native tact, but, so far as culture can produce it, this quality comes more from the study of the mind than from any other source.

* Matt. iii, 9.

† Ibid. xiii, 57.

Nor is the argument yet exhibited in its full force. It has been remarked that, to a great extent, the Bible is historical, that its interpretation calls for historical knowledge and training. But its great purposes are ethical and spiritual. Even the historical parts look to religious ends; its facts are given, not on account of their historical interest, but on account of their spiritual value. Accordingly, its underlying basis is subjective, not objective. The appeal is to a nature the sciences of which are mental and moral philosophy. It follows, therefore, that the Bible must constantly be studied from a subjective stand-point. Some portions of Scripture are profoundly metaphysical; as, for example, the Gospel of John. What is more, some portions of Scripture are written to correct certain modes of thought on religious subjects; others, to expose certain errors of a philosophical character. Much of Christ's teaching is directed to overthrowing that religious habit of mind which sprang from the Jew's complacency regarding himself the chosen and approved of God; as much of Paul's is to correcting certain forms of doctrine arising from the combination of the Gospel with Judaism or Oriental theosophy. Much of both the Testaments was directed to particular individuals and communities, to meet their immediate wants; and no man can understand these parts unless he can enter into the culture and spirit of the individuals and communities addressed. What did certain of the Corinthians mean when they said, "and I of Christ,"* and what led them to say so? What led certain Jews to remind Jesus of those "Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices?"† No man can understand the Epistle to the Galatians, who has not studied that curious intermingling of Christian and Jewish elements which finally culminated in the philosophico-theological doctrine known as Ebionitism; nor can any man grasp Paul's meaning in the simple declaration, "We all have knowledge,"‡ who has not penetrated to a considerable distance that vast labyrinth of speculation known as Gnosticism. Once more, the Bible has a psychology and an ethics of its own. Profound books have been written to develop its philosophy. According to the Bible, how manifold is the nature of man? What is the "soul," and what the "spirit," of which Paul speaks in the First Thessalonians?§ What is the "heart," with which man is said to "believe unto righteousness?"||

* 1 Cor. i, 12.

† Luke xii, 1.

‡ 1 Cor. viii, 1.

§ v, 3.

|| Rom. x, 10.

What is the meaning of the words "mind," "heart," "spirit," "soul," "understanding," and "conscience," as they occur in the Bible? and do they always convey the same ideas? Only a profound philosophy can answer these questions. We call the Gospel plain, and say the Bible is an easy book; so they are from a certain point of view. But if any man supposes the Bible is a shallow pool, to the bottom of which any eye can see, he only shows his own shallowness. The profoundest book in the world is the Bible; far below the longest sounding-line, its depths reach downward to the infinite.

But it is time to say something of systematizing Scripture. The Bible is not a methodical book, in the scientific sense of the term. As revealed in the Bible, Christianity is not a theology; it is not a body or system of divinity; it is not, in the received sense, a plan of salvation. It is marked by the freedom of the spirit, rather than by the rigid forms of the letter. It contains doctrines and facts which are to be deduced from the language, and then combined into a body or system. Now, this deduction and combination are the work of the human intellect, as much so as the deductions and combinations found in science. Here we enter the field of theology, which may be defined as a scientific attempt to interpret, arrange, combine, and explain the materials of the Bible. Every distinct body of Christians has something of this kind; it may be simple and rudimentary, or complex and elaborate, but it is a theology.

Before showing the theologian's need of mental and moral science, it may be best to anticipate an objection. Outside of a few old-fashioned places, there is a general disposition to discredit theology. Practically, it is almost discarded as a useless thing. It is said that the Gospel is not divinity, and that the Gospel, as good tidings, can be preached without reference to systems of dogma. This evidence of change, whether of progress or not, we Disciples hail with peculiar satisfaction. We do not believe in theology, and have never dreamed that we had one. To be sure, we have a plan of salvation, but this we think wholly different. But it is a theology to all intents and purposes. It consists of a number of logical propositions arranged in a certain order. In the formulation, we sometimes use the language of Scripture, sometimes our own; but the result is a logically arranged scheme of doctrine.

Now, this scheme, as thus drawn out, is nowhere found in the
VOL. VIII.—11

Bible. We have made it, by selecting materials here and there, and by combining them in what we think their natural order. We think all the propositions contained in it are true. We think them put together in the order of their affinities. And so, perhaps, they are. But no apostle, so far as we know, ever preached one of our regular plan-of-salvation sermons. This scheme of doctrine may be more simple, more Scriptural and less speculative, more easily understood, than others; such is my own opinion; but it is an attempt of the human intellect to systematize parts of Scripture, and therefore it is a theology. This point being granted, of course all of my brethren are in favor of cultivating theological studies.* From one point of view, the prevailing tendency to disparage and discard theology is commendable; from another, it is to be regretted. Christianity is not bounded by any man's grasp of it. The Gospel may be preached, and generally should be, as the apostles preached it, as good tidings, not as a "system," or a "plan."

"Our little systems have their day;
They have their day, and cease to be;
They are but broken lights of thee,
And thou, O Lord, art more than they."

Theology is not essential to salvation, nor should it be made a test of fellowship in the Church. We do not impose our plan of salvation on the penitent believer as an article of faith. If he accepts and obeys Christ, we are willing to let our "plan" go. In this field we have done a noble work, and we may thank God that the religious world so generally is accepting the doctrine we have so long preached. But there is another side to the question, since theology may have its uses, and does have them, although it be no longer

* In the second volume of Richardson's "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," an account is given of the arrangement of the Gospel elements in the mind of Walter Scott. Scott has been in conference with Bentley and Osborne. "From this moment, Mr. Scott's mind seemed to be engrossed with the consideration of the consecutive *order* appropriate to the various items in the Gospel, and, being greatly given to analysis and arrangement, he proceeded to place them thus: 1. Faith; 2. Repentance; 3. Baptism; 4. Remission of Sins; 5. Holy Spirit. This view relieved at once his previous perplexities, and the Gospel, with its items thus regularly disposed, seemed to him almost like a new revelation. He felt that he had now obtained a clew which would extricate men's minds from the labyrinth in which they were involved in relation to conversion, and enable him to present the Gospel in all its original simplicity." (Pages 208, 209.) What Scott was doing was this: He was theologizing the Scriptural materials in relation to conversion. This transaction is probably as near as we can get to the formation of the new theology on that subject.

used as a confession of faith. Is there to be no more systematic thinking expended on the Bible? Will unconnected scraps and fragments of Scriptural knowledge answer the purposes of religious culture? While we are more and more methodizing other departments of knowledge, are we going to throw away religious method? A Christian may do his work in the world and go up to glory, having hold only of a Bible fact here and a promise there; but he can as successfully study plants, or rocks, or animals, without method, as he can the Bible. It may be considered a phenomenon for a Disciple preacher to recommend the study of theology; but it is time some one should say a word for this great department of knowledge.

Especially does the preacher need a theology. Of course, he should not accept it hastily, nor should he make an abusive use of it. He must remember that, so far as the form is concerned, it is man's work, and not God's. With these qualifications, I am prepared to affirm that the preacher needs a theology both to study by and to preach by. How else shall he understand the analogy of the faith? How else shall he discipline his congregation? Men are disciplined by knowledge thoroughly and systematically taught, not by odds and ends picked up at random. It is true that

"Our little systems have their day;
 . . . have their day, and cease to be"—

true that they are but "broken lights" of God, and that he is "more than they;" but it is also true that the world is governed by systematic thinking. "Say what men may," says Dr. Shedd, "it is doctrine that moves the world. He who takes no position will not sway the human intellect. Logical men, dogmatic men, rule the world. Aristotle, Kant, Augustine, Calvin—these are names that instantaneously suggest systems; and systems that are exact, solid, and maintain their place from century to century."* Let me add, it is my opinion, and one not hastily formed, that a solid and self-consistent theology is one of the great wants of the religious world at the present day. The "babbler" or "seed-picker," to use a word contemptuously applied by the Athenians to Paul, can not satisfy its demands for religious knowledge.

* "Homiletical and Practical Theology," pp. 26, 27.

Having shown the necessity of theology, it remains to point out its dependence on the sciences of the mind.

In the first place, theology is more nearly assimilated to those sciences in substance than to any other. On their speculative side, they deal with the theory of the mental nature; on their practical, they furnish rules for its guidance. Hence, the most useful spiritual analogies lie between religion and the spiritual, not the natural, sciences. In the second place, theology is dependent on them for forms and methods. Never yet has there appeared a theology that had not its philosophical body—sometimes Platonism, sometimes Aristotelianism, sometimes Lockeianism, but always a philosophical body. The creator of every theological system has his philosophical stand-point; Calvin his, Arminius his, Campbell his. Hence, you can never fully understand a theologian's system unless you can catch his philosophical point of view. We talk about men coming to the Bible with their minds blank; but such a thing never yet happened, and it never will happen. Men may come to it without strong prepossessions or violent prejudices, but not without habits of mind and tones of feeling. How different are the accounts that Augustine, Swedenborg, and Campbell give us of what they find in the Bible! Why? A material part of the answer is this: They differ materially in their philosophical views of human nature, of the spirit world, and of God. Theology, more than any other science, runs back into what Dr. M'Cosh calls "the region of fundamental principles; a region, no doubt, often covered with clouds, but where all the streams of science have their fountains."* Let a Bible student undertake to determine the nature and the relations of what in the Bible is called faith, purely questions of theology. What is faith? In what relation does it stand to the intellect? in what to the sensibility? in what to the will? Is it purely the intellectual effect of testimony? Does it differ in nature from our assent to the proposition, "that Alfred was a wise king," or, that "Alexander was a great soldier?" Or is faith choice from the will, conditioned by knowledge on the part of the intellect, and by feeling on the part of the sensibility? These are great questions that press for answer, though no attempt is here made to answer them. In my opinion, no man can answer them intelligently who does not do two things: he must study

* "Method of the Divine Government," New York, 1867, p. 76.

most profoundly the dogmatic statements of the New Testament in relation to the subject, paying especial attention to examples, and he must also minutely analyze the mind, and the effects produced upon it by the preaching of the Cross. He can not do either, especially the latter without a philosophical training. Practically, it is enough to know that preaching is the instrument by which faith is created. Speculatively—what is faith, and in what relation does it stand to the mind?—we need to know something more. Then, in what relation does faith stand to repentance? This is not a matter of dogmatic teaching, and we must infer an answer from all premises, Scriptural and psychological. The design of baptism is taught dogmatically, and is not, therefore, properly a theological question at all.

The necessary connection between philosophy and theology is admirably illustrated in the early history of the Protestant Reformation. The scholastic theology of the mediæval Church was based on the scholastic philosophy. This was Aristotle as interpreted by the mediæval schools. More than five hundred years had been occupied in compressing Christianity into the norms and categories of the Stagirite. The work had been pretty thoroughly accomplished when Luther appeared. The great Reformer's task was threefold—to emancipate Church life from ecclesiastical dominion, moral life from gross ungodliness, religious faith and theological opinion from the crushing weight of the scholastic system. For every blow given to the Pope, a second was given Aristotle. "I believe it impossible," said Luther, "that the Church can be reformed without completely eradicating canons, decretals, scholastic theology, philosophy, and logic, as they are now received and taught, and instituting others in their places." Aristotle was denounced as "a godless bulwark of the Papists." But after demolition came construction. In the words of Ueberweg, "In proportion as Protestantism gained fixed consistency, the necessity of a determinate order of instruction became equally apparent with that of a new ecclesiastical order." Melancthon, who had at first shared the feelings of Luther, selected the groundwork of the first Protestant theology. He said, "We must choose some kind of a philosophy which shall be as little infected as possible with sophistry, and which retains a correct method." "We can not do without the monuments of Aristotle." "I plainly perceive," he said further, "that if Aristotle, who is the unique and only author of method, shall be neglected, a

great confusion in doctrine will follow." Luther modified his earlier opinions, granting that Aristotle might be "useful as a discipline for young people in correct speaking and preaching." Thus Aristotle was elevated to the throne of Protestant theology; only it was the real, not the scholastic, Aristotle. Our just complaint against the Reformers is, not that they studied theology, or that they cast it in the Aristotelian forms; but that they overlooked the difference between theology and the Gospel, and bound their heavy dogmatic burdens firmly on men's shoulders.*

A striking example of the power of philosophical training in the field of Biblical study is found where some of us would least expect its presence—I mean in the life of Alexander Campbell. Mr. Campbell knew no philosophy of the mind except that of John Locke. This his father taught him with the proverbial thoroughness of the Scotch schoolmaster. Before tracing the influence of this teaching on Mr. Campbell's mind, a few words must be said by way of characterizing Locke's system.

Locke's philosophy is a species of a genius that is as old as the Greek philosophers. Plato believed that ideas exist before the several classes of objects, and that these objects become what they are by partaking of these ideas, while Aristotle believed that all the furniture of the mind comes through the senses. With these two great masters originated two schools of philosophy that have continued to this day—one higher and more spiritual, the other lower and more material. Locke belongs to the second group. He traces all our ideas to two sources—sensation and reflection. By "reflection" he probably means consciousness, though that is involved in dispute. His Continental disciples summed up what they understood him to teach in the formula, "There is nothing in the understanding that was not previously in the sense." Whether Locke would have adopted this formula, we need not inquire. Certainly, he found no place in his system for intuitions. A quotation from Dr. Hopkins concerning the tendencies of the two schools:

"The interest in this question is not merely speculative. If it had been, it would probably have died out long ago. It is mainly derived from the tendencies of the two schools. Connected with the origin of knowledge in sensation, there has been a tendency to materialism, to sensualism, to a low standard of morality

* For an account of the rise of Protestant theology, see Ueberweg, "History of Philosophy," New York, 1872, Vol. II, pp. 16-19.

and to the denial of a hereafter. Connected with what has been called the spiritual philosophy, or, sometimes, transcendentalism, there has been a tendency to idealism, to mysticism, to excursions into cloud-land, to forms of expression oracular and obscure, and to an undue exaltation of reason. Men have assumed as the product of reason what was not; they have made out of ideas received in this way, or supposed to be thus received, a kind of inspiration, and have become conceited and dogmatic."*

Now, Mr. Campbell's mind was matter-of-fact, rather than metaphysical; objective, rather than subjective. He took a strong hold of the Lockean doctrine. It was shrouded in no mysteries; it required little analytical power, in which his mind was relatively deficient. His mind assimilated it readily. Hence, the philosophy of sensation determined his view of things; and he constructed his theology from that point of view, as plainly as Augustine constructed his from an Aristotelian point of view, and Schleiermacher his from a transcendental. To be sure, he proclaimed that theology is not to come in the room of the Gospel, and in practice was always faithful to the principle. But the man who denies that Mr. Campbell's teachings are strongly colored by the Lockean philosophy, is a person with whom it is not worth while to argue.

In the debate with Mr. Owen, Mr. Campbell affirmed, as he always did, that the idea of God must have come by revelation, since "reason can not originate the idea of an eternal first cause."† He quotes Locke: "The simple ideas are the materials of all our knowledge, which are suggested and furnished to the mind only by sensation and reflection." He then goes on to show that this idea could not have come from either of these sources. Poor Mr. Owen, himself a sensationist, could say nothing but that the idea came from the imagination! The thoroughness and satisfaction with which Mr. Campbell hewed down this tree, can not have been forgotten by any attentive reader of this debate. That he was on favorite ground, is seen in the frequency with which he returned to the subject, running up and down the gamut of the Lockean philosophy in several speeches—sensation, memory, and reflection. It is worth remarking that, in this particular, Mr. Campbell went further than his master. Locke holds that the existence of God may be inferred from the perfection of nature; but the pupil declares that natural theology is founded upon a

* "Outline Study of Man," pp. 111 and 112.

† Bethany Edition, Vol. I, p. 116, *et seq.*

petitio principii, and scouts the idea of inferring God from nature. He finds no more place for intuitions than his master.

But again, the whole cast of Mr. Campbell's theological system is Lockean. No previous teacher has placed so much stress on the proposition that facts, palpable, unmistakable facts, are the basis of the Christian religion; nor has any other teacher handled these facts with more clearness and power. He also had a remarkably clear and strong grasp of Scripture, as a thing *written*, and capable of being understood. Hence, his habit of bringing things to the test of *what is written*; hence, also, his hostility to transcendentalism and mysticism in the field of religion. His Pegasus trod the dry, hard road of fact, and made no excursions into cloud-land. He takes an objective view of the ordinances; he finds a meaning and a use for all of them; he has too much balance of mind, too much culture, too much spirituality to permit Christianity in his hands to degenerate into legalism; he shuns both sacramentarianism and mysticism. Nevertheless, compared with the current systems, his theology was objective, rather than subjective. It may be said, Mr. Campbell's clear, tangible, consistent view of the Christian system was owing to the native qualities of his mind. This is true in a measure, but not to the exclusion of Locke's influence upon his mind. How different things might have been, if only Mr. Campbell's mind had been early filled with old-fashioned metaphysics! Nor should I omit to mention that the visible success of his own work was largely due to his matter-of-fact qualities and Lockean training. His presentation of the Gospel was bold, objective, clear. He drew the attention, especially, of men who had been bewildered by metaphysical theology. He pointed them to definite propositions to be heard and accepted, and to definite commands to be obeyed. Naturally, he drew around him co-laborers possessing qualities like his own. Men went forth to preach THE WORD. The formula, "The Bible means what it says, and says what it means"—from one point of view, a noble battle-cry; from another, a miserable shibboleth—rang through the land. In this generation, the abler men who continue Mr. Campbell's work, as a class, are not Lockeians; but there is small reason to think his formulation of the elements of the Gospel will be departed from. Some good results of the Lockean habit of mind have been mentioned; there is no need now to speak of those that are evil.

III. A WORD OF CAUTION IN CONCLUSION.

The preacher must not often carry his philosophy into the pulpit; that is the place for the Gospel. For the most part, he must confine his metaphysics to the study. When we come to the table, we desire bread and meat, not some receipts for cooking, and a parcel of baking, roasting, and broiling machinery. Hungry souls come to the house of God for the bread of life, not to view the tools with which the preacher prepares his sermons. Processes are not commonly to be exhibited in public, and tools still less frequently. Results are what the people want. I have said the preacher needs a theology; not, however, to take the place of the Gospel. Constant theological preaching is not profitable. His theology is to be a sort of syllabus of his Biblical studies as illuminated by other sources of knowledge, a key that opens to him the analogy of the faith. In my own ministrations, I seek to be guided by this principle: Always preach according to a theology, but not often a theology; according to a theory, but not often a theory. Accordingly, the preacher is not to prove to men that they have souls; he is to assume it, as Christ did, and preach to them as such. He is not to dispute about conscience and the will, but to preach to men as having both these attributes. He will present truth in a given order, but not spend much time to show that this is the true order. Sometimes he must depart from this rule; occasionally an unsound theology will stand in his way, and must be removed. Often, however, a simple and practical preaching of the Gospel will do more to remove such an obstacle than theological disputation. But there are times when theology must be preached, when the Gospel preached according to a theology will not suffice. So it may sometimes become necessary to correct errors in philosophy, since they prevent the progress of truth. The materialism now so current in both mental and moral science is deadening in its influence on religion. It may be necessary to attack it as philosophical materialism, and to hold up a more spiritual philosophy. No rules can be given to decide such cases; nothing but wisdom in the preacher can determine them. But, as a rule, I adhere to the formula—philosophy for the study, the Gospel for the pulpit. Make no parade of logical and critical implements. Keep tools out of sight, but use the tools all the time for the promotion of culture

and the interpretation and systematizing of Scripture. The wise teacher keeps his science of education, his pedagogics, out of the school-room; he needs them, however, and uses them constantly in their place. By following the same method, the preacher will more and more learn what is in man, and grow in the efficiency of his work.

II.—UNCONSCIOUS ENEMIES OF CHRISTIANITY.

IT is Christianity or nothing. All false religions go down before the march of modern civilization. No enlightened man can worship either Isis or Osiris, Jupiter or Woden, Brahma or Vishnu. The world is saved from the superstitions and cruelties of idolatry. Excepting Christianity, there remains only what science may do. But science, whether we consider its adaptation to such a work, or the irreligious bias of its devotees, gives little promise of any thing reliable. If soul and body rot together in the grave, there is nothing to be said, and science is dumb; if the soul is immortal, science can not demonstrate it, much less declare the duties we owe to this immortality. Had science any tendencies in this direction, yet would it be inadequate; its progress is slow, retrograde at times, and its results uncertain. *Æons* would pass away before this coral-reef could rise above the ocean of ignorance and superstition; *æons* more, before it would be habitable by a majority of our race. Just now, God and eternity are declared to be needless hypotheses; or, if realized at all, they are to be classed with the unknowable. Men, who have thought their way through this subject, will tell you calmly, perhaps sadly, that this one alternative at last confronts them—Christianity or nothing. Said the writer to a skeptical lawyer, "Since you reject Christianity, what other trust have you?" "None, absolutely none!" was the reply. This, at least, is severely logical; for when one has condemned all the evidence for Christ as utterly worthless—history, prophecy, reason, nature, and experience—he has thrown down the pillars of all religious faith whatsoever. There is nothing left whereon nor wherewith to build a new faith. In pro-

portion as other systems disappear in the receding darkness, Christianity rises into the clear light of day. If the war slackens about heathen altars, it is growing fiercer about the cross. Christianity is discussed by the fireside and the wayside. It is the theme of the pulpit, the rostrum, and the press. The cross hangs in every sky, and the nations can but gaze. Momentous questions these! Have we light, or is it the midnight of eternal darkness? Is the coffin the only house prepared for the soul, or is there a life beyond? Is it divine forgiveness, or everlasting guilt?

The world-wide conflict thus introduced to us is an intellectual and a moral one. It can not be decided by sacrificing the wealth of Christendom, nor by the meeting of infidel and Christian armies. We expect no great discoveries nor decisive experiments. We await no angel's coming to trouble the waters. We ask not for sign and miracle. We sleep, not hoping for dreams and revelations. The prophets are in their sepulchers, and the heavens have received the ascending Christ. On the field we now occupy, and with the weapons now in our hands, we must fight this battle. It is a contest between the intelligence and moral power of the Church on the one side, and the intelligence and skill of all the world besides on the other. Shall Christian logicians so work out the problem, and so spread before the world the clear solution, as to satisfy every candid mind and silence every objector? or shall the skeptical world show the most learning, research, and dialectic skill, and, though we have the truth, shall they have the victory?

If, turning the pages of history, and surveying the present condition and attitude of the hostile forces, we shall ask how this great intellectual conflict is going, we shall find many things to cheer us. The nominal Christian population of the globe is more than four hundred millions, and these comprise the wealth, the learning, and the civilization of the age. There is a high degree of missionary zeal. A large percentage of the world's wealth is devoted to intellectual and moral culture. The Sunday-school movement promises much. As the battle sways from the old ground to the new, the issues become fewer and grander. Religion is less a matter of miracle, and more a subject of law and science. The sword of the Inquisitor is sheathed, and national barriers are broken down. False religions and philosophies are waxing old and ready to vanish

away. Even the concentration of infidel forces and the boldness of their attacks are auguries of good, for we shall find the enemy and know where to strike. Still, with all these evidences of progress, we cry in our impatience, "How long, O Lord, how long!" Why are so many millions unsaved? Why do so many reject this religion? It is from God, and the evidence most abundant and unanswerable. Why, then, can not all conscientious, thinking men be made to see it?

In answer to this question, it is evident that, while much is owing to non-investigation, and more to that moral grossness which makes men unwilling to believe because unwilling to obey, still by far the most prolific source of unbelief is the *misrepresentation* of Christianity. This is the Northern hive, whence swarm the Goths and Vandals of infidelity. They do not see Christianity as it is, but only some horrid caricature. The light in which they see even this is subject to double refraction, coming as it does through the dense media of false training and moral prejudice. Is the Roman hierarchy the reign of heaven? Is Protestantism, mangled and bleeding, the body of Christ? Is a Calvinistic creed the Bible doctrine of liberty? Does a Methodist camp-meeting present Scriptural examples of conversion to Christ? "If this is religion," says the objector, "then I want none of it." We have an example of this reasoning in Draper's "Conflict between Religion and Science." In this work the Roman Catholic Church is "religion," and the better teachings of philosophers, "science." When he has twisted these perversions in opposite directions, of course there is a "conflict." Though this is the old logic of comparing a rough saint with a smooth sinner, yet it illustrates how misrepresentations of Christianity are the chief sources of unbelief.

The unconscious enemies of Christianity are the authors of these perversions. I call them *enemies*, because they are not only corrupting the Church, but also giving the unbelieving world its most destructive weapons; and, *unconscious* enemies, because they are doing this in entire ignorance of their hostility to religion, but rather with the pious intention of defending and propagating the faith. There were such in the olden time. When Uzzah, in his over-zeal, stayed the tottering ark of God, he delayed its triumphant bringing into Jerusalem by twenty years. When Peter would dissuade Jesus from going up to Jerusalem to be condemned and crucified, he was an

unconscious enemy of Christ, and heard the rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan." In all the progress of the Church such enemies have existed, and they are exceedingly numerous and dangerous in modern times. It is a sad fact that one may be dangerous to a cause for the triumph of which he would gladly lay down his life. How frequent and fervent should be the prayer, "Cleanse thou me from secret faults!" It is a sadder fact that the great source of unbelief is the innocent enmity of the Church. Its divisions, its multitudinous and absurd creeds; its mistaken zeal; its feeble arguments; its monkish seclusion; its persecuting spirit; its unholy, because overdrawn, sanctity; and its senseless opposition to reason and science, are but too many proofs of this enmity. Our needle-guns are more dangerous to friends than to enemies. Our cannon explode more destructively on this side than our shells on that. Not the gates of Hades, but ourselves we need to fear. Profoundly convinced of this fact, and believing that every Christian desires to be not only the professed, but also the real friend of Christ, the following pages are devoted to this discussion of the unconscious enemies of Christianity.

I. The first mention shall be of those who pledge the Bible, as a book, to an *unscriptural perfection and comprehensiveness*. Let Christian scholars claim constantly for the Bible an unwarranted perfection, and extend its scepter over provinces of thought where it asserts no jurisdiction; and then let the unbeliever show that these claims are unsupported, and that this extension of authority is a usurpation, and the argument is complete. Unconsciously, the Christian vies with the infidel in destroying his own religion. Now, the great body of the Church, and not a few prominent writers, are doing a work of this kind. On the one hand, they claim that the Bible is all, and in the highest sense, the word of God; that the holy men of old, through whom it was given, were mere automata; and that the volume thus given has been miraculously preserved in all its original purity. They practically claim for it absolute authority, not only in religion, where it is admitted to be supreme, but also in geography, history, chronology, medicine, literature, social law, and natural science. It is set forth not only as a book of principles, but also as one of specific commands, intended to regulate, in all ages of the world, the minutest concerns of individual life. On the other hand, it will be shown that

the Bible contains the words of men and angels, good and bad, as well as of God ; that the writers drew on their own sources of knowledge, had a style of their own, and wrote in harmony with the then state of human knowledge ; that the text of Scripture has come down to us borne by the natural currents of literature, and not without many an interpolation and corruption ; and that it was given to men of other times and states of civilization, and needs a wise discrimination and application to this remote age. It will be shown that, as a treatise on geography, history, medicine, government, and many other human sciences, it is a failure.

Nothing could be more disastrous to Christianity than these false notions among the masses—notions destined to be taken away, and with them the Bible itself. The remedy is not to be found in a dogmatic and blind defense of these pseudo claims. Nothing will serve Christianity but the truth. A true position alone can be defended. Our views of inspiration must harmonize with the facts, and not exclude them. We must show that the extension of the Bible beyond the province of religion is an abuse. Admitting the human transmission of the Scriptures, we must show that various readings and interpolations do not touch any essential fact or doctrine. We need maintain only that the Bible “is able to make us wise unto *salvation*.” We need not barricade the progress of the age with Bibles, unless a sound exegesis shall lay upon us the command.

II. A second class represent Christianity as something *wholly apart from reason and science*. In many a sermon, reason is denounced as weak, corrupt, and presumptuous. Reason and faith are held up in contrast ; the one to be condemned and scouted, the other to be trusted and extolled. Every thing is to be taken on authority. To ask the reason why is an unpardonable sin. Clergymen are sent to cram their dogmas down our throats, however our moral stomachs may loathe and reject them. Reason must do homage to religious dogmatism. The less reason, the better Christian. The less reasoning in the pulpit, the better preaching. “Reason and Religion” is the subject of any amount of pious and learned nonsense. From the sacred desk and in religious periodicals, science is often the subject of disparagement and ridicule. Much that is false, and some things that are true, are said about the limited vision, the inadequacy, and

the hypothetic and shifting nature of science. As in politics and religion, so in science and religion, there is a desire to have them served on separate plates. We tolerate a science of mind and of morals, but what Church would hear any thing about the science of religion? Here, as before, Christians and unbelievers are working together to build up an argument against religion. It is clear that if Christianity is against reason and science, it is not from God. When the preacher decries reason and science, the infidel says, 'So I thought, and so I have been constantly affirming; it is unreasonable, and must go down under the stunning blows of science.' These tirades against science are only widening the breach, and causing multitudes of earnest men to turn away in disgust.

Rightly considered, what have reason and science to do with religion? Much every way. The term *reason* is used in three different senses: to denote the intuitive faculty, when it is called "the reason;" to denote the ratiocinative faculty, or that mental activity by which we deduce conclusions from admitted premises; and to designate man's whole mental nature as distinguished from instinct. Now, in whatever sense used, reason is indispensable in religion. Without reason, in the first sense, there could be no conscience, no idea of right and wrong, no perception of obligation to do right, and no condemnation if we do wrong. Without the reason, man would not be a religious being; for conscience must go with us into all religious duties, and we are to seek constantly to have consciences void of offense toward men and toward God. Without reason in the last two senses, religion is equally impossible. How can one incapable of seeing the relation between proposition and proof believe in Christ? How could he be held accountable? Reason is the faculty to which God appeals. It is the only avenue through which a revelation can reach us. It must decide whether a professed revelation is really such. And how does the preacher reach the conclusion that reason has little to do with religion, except by delivering a sermon on the subject, except by reasoning about it; but if reason is invalid when employed about religion, then his sermon, or reasoning on the subject, is equally invalid.

It is not the province of reason to manufacture premises. "What can we reason but from what we know." Both nature and revelation furnish us the great facts from which we reason concerning them

Nor can reason reach beyond the premises ; it only serves to analyze and bring out what is implied in them. The idea of a revelation, indeed, implies the inability of reason to discover the things revealed. And yet we are not asked to believe any thing unreasonable ; nor would it be possible, if we were. To believe that Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead is reasonable, because the proof is conclusive. It would be most unreasonable to reject such evidence. *How* Jesus performed this miracle we do not understand nor believe, but only the fact. And so, generally, what we believe is always that portion of the matter in hand which we understand. In this respect, religion stands with all other sciences. He who goes beyond reason is walking in darkness. If we obey the commands of Christ, it is not without reason ; we do it because he is divine and infallible. Instead of depreciating reason, would it not be better to urge the unbeliever to a more vigorous and well directed use of reason. It is not very manly, to say the least, to persuade our opponent to meet us unarmed of reason. Let us rather meet and conquer him with all his armor on.

Science, instead of being the enemy, is a co-worker and servant of religion. We should judge beforehand that these two departments would illuminate each other. They have the same author. All truth is harmonious. Separate systems of truth combine to form the one universe of science. The natural and the supernatural are but halves of the same sphere. Science is the methodical statement of God's thoughts, as embodied in natural forms. If Christianity presents the divine thoughts concerning us, it must be in the highest sense scientific. The crystal, the leaf, and the wing of the insect, are constructed under perfect laws. Science exhausts her technicalities and her formulas in explaining even man's physical nature. Mind is also subject to law. Now, if we find science in all the universe besides, and every force and process guided by immaculate law, how can we suppose that in the higher realm of religion the All-wise works fortuitously and without wisdom ? Mental, moral, and social science are closely allied to religion. Religion appeals to the intellect, it purifies the moral nature, it regulates the family, and gives laws to the state ; it gives direction and impetus to every measure for the civilization of degraded races of men. Does religion seek to do this in contravention of these sciences, or in harmony with them ? If the

latter, then, certainly, these sciences will justify and explain the methods and requirements of religion.

Nor does physical science refuse this service. It is occupied in discovering the plans, the thoughts, and the methods of the Divine Worker. If there be thought in nature, then there is an Infinite Thinker. However atheistic scientific men and theories may be, they are piling demonstration mountain high relative to the being and attributes of God. Natural science is removing all presumption against the immortality of the soul. Matter is found to be quite as subtle and unknowable in its essence as spirit. The indestructibility of matter, the conservation of force, the infinitude of beings below, as well as above, man, and their immense variety, are all parts of this argument.

We should welcome every sound argument for Christianity, from whatever source it comes; and certainly there is nothing more natural or more worthy of Christianity than that the works of God should corroborate his word. If the preacher can show that nature coincides with revelation relative to the natural attributes of the deity; if he can illustrate from history, what the Bible declares, that all have sinned; if he shall show that there underlie the atonement the profoundest principles of government; if he shall point out the adaptation of the Gospel to change the heart and life; or if he shall show the reasonableness of the awards annexed to the divine commands—who can object, or upon what grounds? This would not underrate nor weaken other proofs. It is not an admission that the older evidences are inadequate. There are also other reasons for this method of treatment. A large and growing class are accustomed to this method, who are not skilled in weighing historic proofs. Scientific books, periodicals, and communities are greatly multiplied. Illustrations drawn from science are generally understood. How greatly it expands the horizon to see that Christianity is in perfect accord with every natural and spiritual law! How it exalts our religion to a companionship with the very stars, to show that He who spoke by prophet and apostle, in the olden time, is the same Almighty One who spoke worlds into being and flooded them with life and light. Churches are not ruined by this broad, Christian culture, as some suppose. It is rather those who move in narrow, sectarian grooves, who are mainly bent on teaching how to spell and pronounce

the party shibboleth, and who are ever acting the religious demagogue, that ruin the Churches. If this be the true relation of science and Christianity, what shall we say of those theological schools which are confined to endless genealogies and disputes about words? Of the two, would it not be better for the ministerial candidate to seek first a thorough literary and scientific education and then trust the pressure and opportunities of his profession for Biblical training? or, rather, would it not be *best* to unite both in a broad and thorough culture of both science and theology?

III. A third class consists of *those who pledge the Bible to false science*. Here the professed friends of Christianity unite with its avowed enemies to build an adverse argument. Who so competent to interpret the Bible as life-long theologians? and who so worthy of confidence as men eminent in science? Now, if these shall place the Bible and science in diametric antagonism, how can this result otherwise than disastrously to the Church? Doctors of divinity, from their pulpits, may decry science, and vigorously apply the Scriptural epithet of "science falsely so-called;" but the great world, swayed as it is by an irreligious bias, will desert the theologians and follow the savants. This antagonism, of course, is wholly chargeable to vicious interpretation, since the word and the works of God are in perfect accord. That human science is progressive and that this progress implies a continual recasting of present theories, scientific men themselves will freely admit; but it is also true that not a few Christian scholars are persistently and blindly pledging the Bible to false science. This was done in former ages, as witness the efforts to array the Bible against the progress of geography, and the opposition of the Roman Church to the Copernican system of astronomy. 'Does not,' said they, "the Bible speak of the ends of the earth? Did not the sun stand still in the valley of Ajalon, and the shadow go back on the dial of Ahaz? Does not the sun come forth as a bridegroom from his chamber, and rejoice as a strong man to run a race?" It is not only possible, but quite certain, that this folly is being repeated in this enlightened age.

There is a large class who understand the Bible as maintaining the following theses:

1. The universe is not more than six thousand years old.

2. God spoke the world into existence in a sort of magniloquent Miltonic way.

3. God's days are like man's, and only twenty-four hours long.

4. There was no death in the world till Adam sinned.

5. It did not rain till the time of the Flood, and there was no rainbow till then.

6. The Deluge was universal to our globe, and the animal kingdom was collected, crowded into the ark, kept alive, and distributed again, all by miracle.

The design and limits of this paper forbid any discussion of the merits of these questions. This, however, may be said. The believer in the Bible who affirms these propositions enters upon a gratuitous work. He is not compelled to their maintenance. He need not pledge the Bible to doubtful, not to say false, science. The sacred writer does not date that "beginning" when God created the heavens, and the earth. *How* God made the world, he does not say. Science, without fear of excommunication, may discover this if she can. The word day, in the first chapter of Genesis, does not of necessity mean twenty-four hours. When it is said this is its plain literal meaning, we have a bold *petitio principii*. In this chapter and the first of the next, as Professor Dana has shown, Moses uses the word in no less than five different senses. Green, in his excellent Hebrew grammar, shows that this word has great breadth of meaning. The first day, with its long primeval night; the third, when the continents were elevated and the seas formed; the sixth, when man performed so much work and had such varied experiences; and the seventh, lasting till the present time as God's Sabbath relative to this world, were evidently long periods. Very probably the other days were like them. Could the twenty-four hour interpretation be fixed upon the word, what would be gained? Nothing whatever, and much would be lost. Granting the larger meaning, the order of creation, as given by Moses, is corroborated by every science competent to testify. Why sacrifice, without necessity, so powerful an argument for the inspiration of the first utterances of the Bible? The penalty of death was annexed to human sin, and there is no need to interpret this as being more extensive than the crime. Why so construe the Scriptures, and that without necessity, as to call the ancient generations of plants and animals from their graves to testify against them? The account of

the Deluge is susceptible of a better construction than that which makes it universal. Why, then, make it more extensive than the race to be destroyed? Why submerge the entire globe to purge the earth of a few tribes in Western Asia? for it is not at all probable that the race spread far over the earth till after the dispersion from the plains of Shinar. If the Scriptures themselves give us sea-room, why run into the straits or cling to the rock-bound coast?

Generally, those who dogmatize the most are least entitled to a hearing. The ease and self-assurance with which some preachers declare what the Bible *must* mean, and their off-hand relegation of scientific theories, facts, and authorities to the shades of uncertainty, would be simply ridiculous, if it were not so harmful to the cause of Christianity. It is even more pitiful when men who have spent their whole lives in scientific pursuits, who have narrowed their minds down to the study of some particular monad, or who have nearly gone crazy over protoplasm, shall assume to pronounce on historical evidence and religious doctrines. Such charlatanism brings both science and religion into disrepute.

IV. *Those who hold unreasonable doctrines and seek to fasten them upon the Bible* constitute a fourth class. By *unreasonable doctrines* is not meant, in this connection, doctrines about which reason says nothing, and which are above reason. Of course, such doctrines can be known only by revelation, and reason has only to say whether the professed revelation is of divine authority or not. This reference is rather to doctrines which are inconsistent with the admitted intuitions and deductions of reason. Infidels endeavor to load down Christianity with the religious wars and persecutions involved in its history; with Church quarrels and divisions, with the weaknesses and immoralities of its advocates. With these infidels many good and great men unite, when to this already crushing burden they add tons of unreasonable and absurd dogmas.

Among illustrative examples, Calvinism is entitled to take the lead. It never saved a soul; for salvation is through faith in Christ and obedience to him. Myriads have stumbled over it into hell. It is concentrated fatalism. From eternity the Unchangeable One elects and reprobates. This election is made sure by a partial atonement; for Christ, according to this doctrine, died only for the elect. To make

this fatality doubly fatal, men are totally depraved, and are only capable of doing evil, and that continually. Lest this depravity should, by some mischance, prove ineffectual, Calvinism makes sure that none shall believe and be saved without the "effectual call." Still further, the Almighty's hand is on those who are called, and however they may wander and resist, they are bound to persevere and be saved. This election was determined by no merit in the saved, nor by any foresight that they would believe in Christ, but solely by the arbitrary will of God. This untrue and degrading view of human nature, this blasphemy against the character of God, this theological system having so much more damnation in it than salvation—these, if any things, are condemned of reason as moral absurdities. The wonder that so many generations should commit the keeping of their souls to such a system is only second to the greater wonder that so many good and learned men can subscribe to a creed which they no longer believe nor preach. And yet there is a true doctrine of election. God, at various times, elected men and nations to carry out his plans, though not to eternal life. He has elected character rather than persons. It is an election through belief of the truth and sanctification of the Spirit—an election in which the soul itself gives the casting vote. Calvinism is sustained by obscure passages, and far-fetched metaphysical inferences. As a system of human speculations, it is but cobwebs, compared with the universal commands, promises, and whosoever-wills of the Divine Word.

Equally absurd is that tenet of Arminianism which teaches that a person can not understand and obey the Gospel till he has become the subject of miraculous converting-power. It makes little difference whether the election and reprobation were an eternity ago, or in this life. In either case the doomed soul has no alternative. In either case God is represented as refusing men the power to believe, and then condemning them for not believing.

Another example is the claim of sanctification, in the sense that one can reach such a state of perfection that he no longer commits sin. If by attending a so-called "holiness-camp-meeting," or by importunate prayer, one could rise to such serene heights, it would be a consummation devoutly to be wished; especially would it be a good thing if some of our public men could graduate in this school before their election to office. That sinlessness is to be approximated by

feeling, rather than by learning and doing ; that this quick and patent method is better than the old-fashioned way ; that we can surpass prophets and apostles, or reach such a stage that we shall need no advocate with God, are suppositions sufficiently daring ; and we have no need to face the Scripture declaration, that "if a man say he has no sin, he is a liar, and the truth is not in him."

Christian learning and piety have often been employed in giving the sanction of heaven to systems of immorality and oppression. The blessings of God have been invoked on the cruellest tyrannies. Scripture texts have been patched together by ingenious men to hide the deformities of states and institutions. Intemperance continues its ravages by the sufferance of professed Christians. The Church has the power to slay this monster at a single blow. If these unconscious enemies could make Christianity support oppression and crime, this success would be fatal to our religion. The moral purity of Christianity, like the sinlessness of its Founder, is the rock on which it is built. As the sun needs no proof that it hangs in mid heaven, but its own light and heat, so the moral purity of Bible teaching declares its divine origin.

Again, there are whole nations who maintain that Roman Catholicism is Christianity ; and it must be admitted that they are sincere in this. In proportion, however, as they shall succeed, will they undermine the religion they profess to love. Men of reading and thought can never believe that any pope, however wise and good, is God's vicegerent, is infallible in the interpretation of the Bible, or immaculate in the management of the Church. The nineteenth century can not brook the Romish confessional, which, in its very nature, is an invasion of the sanctity of home. The sale of indulgences, of masses for the dead, and of prayers for souls in purgatory, are but so many means by which the priest may hold his victim over the pit of hell, and threatens to drop him in, unless he pays handsomely. The horrors of the Inquisition, the impurity of its priests, and its grasping after political power, reveal its true character. History, reason, and science impeach it of high crimes and misdemeanors.

It is evident that all these advocates of error are enemies of true religion, however unconscious of this enmity and however pious they may be. And it is evident, furthermore, that Christianity must make slow progress while these things stand in its way.

V. Another class of unconscious enemies is composed of some of the most pious and zealous members of the Church—*those whose ideas of conversion, and methods of promoting it, are not in harmony with mental and moral science.* The prevalent and misnamed orthodox teaching concerning conversion, is, undoubtedly, the chief obstacle to the propagation of Christianity. In one view, it is a marvel that all do not accept this religion. Its demands are evidently right ; for they are simply that we shall do the best for ourselves and our fellow-men. It enjoins the noblest life. In this world it brings to us the peace of God, and, in the world to come, life everlasting. It requires the renunciation of no real enjoyment, of no permanent good. The disappointments and sorrows of this life, our consciousness of guilt, and our fear to tread the lonely pathway of the grave, powerfully dissuade us from the rejection of this, our only hope. Against these pleadings within and without, pride of consistency, fear of man, and the love of sinful pleasure, could not prevail. If the earth repels and all the stars attract, how shall we not leave this blighted world and soar to the heavens? So it was in the ancient times. Three thousand accepted the first offer of mercy. Two thousand were the result of a second sermon. In less than three centuries the whole civilized world acknowledged the lordship of the Nazarene. Now, after months of preaching, we rejoice over a few scores or hundreds. The vast multitudes remain unmoved. There are various causes for this difference, but among them all the most potent hinderance is this popular but unreasonable and unscriptural view of conversion. A charge so grave as this requires careful statement and proof.

First, conversion is presented, not as a moral change to be brought about by moral means, and as something to be done by the moral agent, but as a spiritual change, to be wrought by divine and superhuman power. The teaching from ten thousand pulpits is, that faith, repentance, and a consequent change of life, are no part of conversion, but that above and beyond these we must have what is called a “change of heart,” or the “new birth.” This inward renewal is secured by an act of special mercy, and made known to the recipient by a special and peculiar experience. This experience is the passport into the Church, and often the only hope of heaven. *Secondly*, it is evident that, in order to secure such a conversion, two things must be done. The sinner must be induced to believe in Christ and

repent, as necessary conditions ; and then the believing penitent must unite with the Church in supplication for this divine grace, for this spiritual change. Both God and the sinner must be converted. After the preaching to sinners, there must be the praying to God. The first meeting is for sinners, but the second is for God ; and the latter is usually the longest, most earnest, and most uncertain. *Thirdly*, the evidence of this conversion is not the certainty of any divine promise, nor the compliance with any divine commands, but this experience rather. This is a brief but just statement of popular teaching and practice. There may be minor differences, but these are the prominent features.

The consequences of this teaching are most injurious. There is reason to doubt the validity of the professed experience. It can not be clearly defined ; and, in fact, no two are alike. One sees a light, and another dreams a dream. Some fall as dead, and others shout till they are hoarse. Mental excitement and anguish of soul prevent all calm observation and judgment ; and yet upon this change, life and death depend. How much of this experience is owing to joy consequent upon submission to God and to sympathy with the joy of our praying friends, and how much to this spiritual change, none can tell. Belief in its reality is exceedingly fluctuating. It depends on mental states. In times of despondency, when most needed, it vanishes away. A large portion of Christian people have a "standing doubt," where there ought to be the utmost certainty. Besides, if this change is real, why is it not relied upon as a continual miracle in proof of Christianity ?

It certainly would be miraculous, and as demonstrative as the raising of the dead. Instead of prophet, apostle, or argument, call in a score of witnesses, put them under oath, and let them testify. But this is never done, because Christians themselves have so little confidence in it. The overthrow of such a claim has a powerful recoil against religion itself. Another result is, that "getting religion" becomes an experiment, and few men like to subject themselves to such experiments, and that in a public manner. It is a trial, and often a failure. Many a penitent suppliant turns away from the anxious-seat a confirmed infidel. Few like to submit to the manipulations and whisperings of a certain class of revivalists and their fanatical helpers. This is all so different from every thing else, and

all so foreign to their methods of investigation and self-determination, as to prevent even a trial of this way. Further, this view represents God as being most capricious. Now he loves the world and gives his Son for it. He sends abroad the Gospel proclamation, inviting whosoever will to come and live; and yet he is so unwilling to hear and forgive that all this importunity is needed; nay, is often unavailing.

By this view, Churches are restricted and greatly hindered in their efforts to evangelize. Revivals are believed to come as special providences. The rain may fall on one country but not on another. There may be a work of grace at Pittsburg, but can not be at Cincinnati, unless God comes down the river. Most Churches sit, like Elijah on Mt. Carmel, with their heads bowed upon their knees, waiting till some sign shall appear. There is also, on this view, a wonderful misdirection of effort. If Churches would reason and plead with sinners as they do with God, the world would soon be converted. Not that it is wrong to pray for things God has promised, but we do not *truly* pray unless we work for the fulfillment of our prayers. This view of conversion leads to the wildest extravagance and fanaticism. Prayers are offered that the Holy Spirit may "just now" touch the hearts of distant friends and convert them; as if these friends would not have been converted long ago, if it depended solely on the divine will. Hammond revivals sweep over society like cyclones from the tropics, leaving only years of religious declension in their path.

The apostles advanced no theory of spiritual influence. They preached not the Holy Spirit, but Christ and him crucified. They plainly declared the conditions by an honest compliance with which every man might have the divine assurance of pardon. Such preaching now, as then, would commend itself to the reason and conscience of the most gifted and cultivated men, and also be level to the comprehension of the great mass of mankind.

VI. The last class to be considered is composed of *those who are devoted to the maintenance of denominationalism*. It is no more certain that these are unconscious of hostility to Christianity than that religious parties are injurious to the Church; both must be granted. The Savior established but one kingdom, and he prayed that all his

followers might be one as he and the Father were one, that the world might believe that God had sent him. Nothing would so hasten the day of millennial glory as the organic and spiritual union of all believers in Christ. Those who take the opposite position do so in disregard of the prayer of Christ, the purest aspirations of the Church for peace and universal fellowship, the results of union in ancient and modern times, and the deep conviction of nearly the whole Christian world. They are only exercising their ingenuity in defense of a bad case. Denominationalism not only distracts and discourages those who are seeking Christ, but it is also a powerful weapon in the hands of infidels.

Multitudes would abandon sectarianism and this unconscious hostility to Christ, if they could see any way out of the labyrinths of Protestant creeds and parties. This is undoubtedly a most difficult problem. It implies not only the opening of the prison doors and the great iron gate, but also unbinding the prisoners and inducing them to escape. It would be to this age what the Reformation under Luther was to the sixteenth century. Without claiming the solution of this problem, which perhaps is possible only to Divine Providence, a few suggestions only are offered.

1. Those who maintain denominationalism mistake the purpose of the Church. It was commissioned to publish the Gospel and help men in their struggle against sin. It does not receive men to doubtful disputations and the discussion of endless genealogies. It is not a convention for the adoption of a creed. It is not an Inquisition to try and burn heretics. It is not its province to keep an *index expurgatorius* of men as well as of books. But it is a home for those who would break off their sins by righteousness. Its sole business is to *help* those who are ready to perish. How sadly the Christian world has forgotten this! While the day is far spent, and uncounted millions are ready to perish, we are settling dogmas, measuring one another's relative soundness, and arranging the etiquette of worship! A man may be very ignorant, and consequently very unsound, and yet be a child of God. If we must all be "sound" in order to be saved, God have mercy on those who *think* they are sound.

2. Again, it may help us to consider that all truth is not equally important. There are truths which were all important to men of ancient times, but which have little to do with us. There are other

truths which will be important when we come to them. How evil came into existence is an interesting question, and also whether the soul is conscious between death and the resurrection or not; but they have little to do with the present time. Men *are* sinners, and it *is* appointed unto men once to die. The present truth is essential. How shall dying men be saved, is the great practical question. It is an ever-present truth that we should add to our faith courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. If we should erase from our creeds all dead and all unborn truths, they would become wondrously short and simple. Passing over a thousand questions whose discussion only serves to divide, weaken, and delay, let us hasten to the rescue of the shipwrecked multitudes.

3. How far should we hold ourselves responsible for the religious views of other people? Before we set about the task of making all men see alike on every subject, it might be well to ask if this would be pleasing to the Lord. Has any man a right to thrust himself between another man's soul and his God? Is it not the right and the duty of every man to study the Bible for himself, as he must answer for himself before the judgment-seat of Christ? Who would assume the responsibility of another man's soundness in religious matters? Who, even if he had the power, would make all men believe as he does? It is our duty, indeed, to give all the light we can, and also to receive it from whatever source; but, further than this, how can we be responsible? And yet the great object of the struggling sects is the questionable privilege of regulating the beliefs of all others. In their over-self-confidence, they would make all others like themselves. Shall we disfellowship whole parties because they differ from us in matters not essential to salvation? Would such a course make matters better? Would it not be our duty, rather, to mingle with them and afford them light? Besides, our own eyes might be opened. If Baptists have light which Methodists need, and *vice versa*, how are they to illumine one another in total isolation? Difference of religious views is generally a reason for association, and not for Pharisaic separation.

4. Again, it might be useful to inquire what association with religious people implies an indorsement of their heresies. Do we indorse their errors when we go along the street with them? when we trade with them? when they become business partners? when we read their

books? when we hear their preaching? when we pray with them? when we work with them in helping on benevolent enterprises? If any or all of these acts imply an indorsement of all the views of associated persons, then who can be saved? We must needs go out of the world. All this demonstrates that the basis of union must be simple, and composed only of saving truth.

5. Finally, in our search for a plan of union, it would be well to ask if there is a Scriptural, a divine plan. What was the one truth to be believed in ancient times? What degree and kind of union prevailed then, and how was it secured? Particularly, how were Jews and Gentiles made one in Christ? This divine plan might be worth ten thousand of human invention.

Incomplete as this enumeration of the unconscious enemies of Christianity may be, it suffices to show two things: *First*, that the greatest hinderance to the progress of Christianity comes from the Church itself. Historical criticism, false science, and infidel ridicule, are nothing compared with this. These unconscious enemies are all the more to be dreaded because they are sincere and pious. Their complete removal requires ages of religious progress. It should lead to prayerful searchings of heart and life, to find and bring into judgment any lurking and unconscious enmity to Christ that may be there. *Secondly*, it shows the inherent power of Christianity. It can endure the mistakes of its friends as well as the attacks of its enemies. Notwithstanding both, it is marching on from conquering unto conquest.

IV.—ABOUT GOD AND CREATION.

WHO is God? What is God? Is there a God? God is an intellectual necessity; that is, the human mind is so constructed that it *must* believe in God. We are in painful unrest till we rest in God. God is the inevitable goal of all true thinking. A thousand paths lead us to him. Every leaf, every star, lands us in him. Who made this grass-blade? Nature? How could that be? Has nature intelligence and volition? Is nature an agent? Is not nature rather simply the visible garment which at once hides and reveals the God who works through it? Who made the stars? Did each star make itself? How could it act before it *was*? Did one father star make all the others? But who made this father star? Itself? Every body says, No! It had no will; it was, therefore, itself but an effect; it was *caused*. If caused, then it was caused by a cause. But who caused this cause? Another cause? This does not help the matter. The Indian fable of the world resting upon an animal, and this animal upon another, and so on, is only an irony, and was never believed for a moment, even by a child. A cause that is not itself an effect—a first cause, a cause of all secondary causes—*this* is what we need; this is called for by all consecutive thought; to this we are intuitively and irresistibly driven by our very intellectual inability to think the contrary. If, therefore, *any* of our thoughts are true, this is true—that there is a First Cause. That is, if we know any thing at all, we know that there is a God. This is to the mind what Noah's ark was to the dove. We might try to rest upon the glittering waves of idealism or pantheism, but only for a moment; sure footing is found only in the ark of *God*.

But *what* is God? He is cause, and he is first. As *first* there was nothing before him, nor in fact any thing as early *as* he. For he was *before* all things; that is, all things *but* him were subsequent (logically at least) *to* him. But how about time and space? Time and space *are not* really at all. They are not things, but thoughts; they are not entities, but mere conceptions, mere forms of thought. They have not positive existence. But God *is* positive;

he exists ; and before and above and beneath him, there was and is *nothing*. As first and as cause, God is uncaused cause ; hence, he is independent. How and why he exists is incomprehensible ; we are simply under a constitutional necessity of admitting that he does exist. This necessity, however, having been once yielded to, light, glory, and order stream thereupon over the universe. Now we can understand many things ; before this we could understand nothing. As first cause, God is now known to be the primary cause of all that is *not* God. He is the Creator of all the substances and beings in the universe. We can not prove this, we can only *know* it ; for it is more certain than any proof—resting upon that which is the ground of all proof ; namely, our intuitions, and, more particularly, the intuition of cause and effect.

As *first* cause, God is the source of all the power and order and life of the universe. The magnitude of the universe calls for power in its Cause ; its order calls for reason ; its life calls for life. The “things seen” reveal the qualities of their Maker. God is, therefore, *potent* and *rational* and *living*. From our inability to think of God as limited or imperfect, we are forced to regard him as perfect and unlimited, at least from without. He is limited only from within ; namely, by the very perfections of his being. Being perfect power, he can not be weakness ; being perfect wisdom, he can not be unwise ; being perfect harmony, he can not be disharmony. God “can not lie ;” this is the sole sort of inability or imperfection that belongs to him. But this is no imperfection at all.

Reason and the Church express the scope of God's attributes by prefixing to them the word *all* ; thus, God is (*all*-powerful) *omnipotent*, *omnipresent*, *omniscient*, etc. But what do we mean by this ? We do not mean that he exerts all the power that is exerted ; for we are conscious that he does *not* ; *we* exert *some* power ourselves. We can only mean that he is adequate to all the exertions of power that are called for by his infinite wisdom.

What now do we mean by saying that God is omnipresent ? Not that he is actually present at every point in space ; for then he would *fill* all space, seeing that he is not an abstraction but a substantiality ; then there would be no space left ; and then pantheism would be true ; for both we and the rocks and the stars occupy a part of space ; for God is a positive entity, and we and the stars are

so also ; and two positive entities can not occupy the same point of space at the same time. All we can mean, therefore, by God's omnipresence is, that he is *potentially* present at every point of universal space ; that is, that he is *able* to be present wherever his infinite wisdom calls for his presence.

But what do we mean by God's omniscience? We can only mean that he knows all that is a possible object of knowledge. He knows all that *is*, and *as* it is. He knows all the past and all the present, and all that is causally involved in the present state of the universe. He knows all that is the truth ; the false he knows as false, the true as true. He knows things *as* they *are* ; for example, if my final moral destiny is as yet uncertain and unfixed, then he knows it *as* uncertain and undetermined. But does not this view subject God's knowledge to the limitations of time? Yes ; for it *is* so limited. God's knowledge is as really limited by time as ours. Before he created the world he knew that it did *not* exist ; after he had created it, he knew that it *did* exist. If God ever has a new thought, he then knows something which he did not know before ; otherwise it were not a new thought. God's knowledge is, therefore, constantly being modified and increased. Whenever a planet or a sparrow ceases to be, then the knowledge of it as an actuality passes out of the storehouse of God's knowledge of actualities. Whenever a new planet becomes a reality, then God's knowledge of realities is increased by so much. All of which amounts to this : God's knowledge is a knowledge of *truth*—it embraces the past *as* past, the present *as* actual, the future *as* contingent. But are not all the events and acts of the future locked up and involved in actually existing chains of causation? And if so, does not an exhaustive knowledge of the present embrace all that ever will be? Yes ; if they are so locked up. But they are *not* ; the intuition of creatural freedom denies it and intuition is demonstration. The true expression of God's omniscience is, therefore, this : God knows all that has been, all that is, and all that is *necessarily going to be*.

As being potent, God has a will ; for nothing has power but will, or that which has will. This will, as in union with omniscience, involves infinite practical reasonableness, or wisdom. The infinite wisdom guides the will ; the will actualizes the wisdom. Hence there results absolute self-consistency. This self-consistency is the one

mother-virtue of God, whereof all the other so-called moral virtues or attributes are simply special phases. What, for example, is God's holiness but his wholeness, his rounded completeness, that is, his self-consistency? What is his justness or his truthfulness but his fidelity to his promises? What is his righteousness but his treating his creatures according to the nature and relations which he gave to them? and what is all this but his self-consistency? What would unrighteousness in God be but his coming into conflict with his own nature, or with the nature with which he has gifted his creatures? The cardinal virtue of God is, therefore, self-consistency.

From this stand-point we are enabled at once to see the sole true ground of right. The ground of right is the nature of God, as expressing itself through his will. This is evident from the sufficiency of this ground, and from the inconceivability of any other ground. For what was there before God as a ground for right? Nothing. What is there now above God? Nothing. What was before all things? God. What is the source of all things? God. By what alone is God governed? By his own perfections. What, then, is the rule of God's will? This will itself, or, what amounts to the same thing, himself. What are the products of the outgoings of God's will? Creatures and the consequent relations of creatures. When creatures live true to their natures and relations, what do we call their conduct? Right. What is the ground of the natures and relations of creatures? The creative will of God. God is, therefore, right when he is true to himself; that is, when he is self-consistent; man is right when he is true to God.

But is God always true to himself; is God's creative will a sufficiently immutable ground of right? It is the most immutable thing in the universe; for it is the source of all the immutability that there is in it. But, for that matter, it *is* absolutely immutable—in the sense of absolute self-consistency. But how is this made to appear? It results from the very idea of God as the absolutely perfect one. God has perfect knowledge, perfect wisdom, perfect power. Having perfect knowledge, he never makes a mistake. Having perfect wisdom, he chooses always the best thing and the best course. Having perfect power, he always accomplishes what he plans. He can, therefore, never possibly have any ground for undoing what he has done, or for doing it otherwise than as he did, and does, do it; that is to

say, he can never contradict himself, never be other than self-consistent ; and this is the only immutability required, or even possible, in a perfect, rational personality. Hence, the creative will of God furnishes the highest immutability required in the ground or standard of right.

And this does not in the least preclude God's absolute freedom and liberty. God is absolutely immutable (in the sense of self-consistency), and yet absolutely free. He always does just what he chooses, and his choices are absolutely free ; and yet he never does wrong, and never *can* do wrong. If he could do wrong, then that wrong would cease to be wrong ; then right and wrong would no longer exist. All of which amounts to this : The thought of God's doing wrong is absurd, because a contradiction in terms. God is the source and measure of right ; how can the source of right be wrong ? God's inability to do wrong is a perfection resulting from this very definition. To do wrong would be to contradict his previous self ; and self-contradiction implies imperfection ; but how could the Perfect One be imperfect ? His very nature renders it impossible. This does not imply a limitation of his freedom, but, on the contrary, a perfection. His freedom is not a single sphere of his being, that may possibly conflict, for example, with his wisdom and truthfulness, but it is a trait of his entire nature. God *has* not freedom ; but God *is* free. His whole nature is *one* nature ; and the one trait of his nature is vital self-consistency.

Such is our conception of God. Is it correct ? If not, wherein is it wrong ? Every Christian, who is not dead, must study the subject, and ask and re-ask the question for himself ; for it is only in this way that he can be sure that his God, that is, his notion of God, is better and truer than the fetich of the Hottentot.

Having found who God is, we next come to creation, or the universe. But what is creation ? All that has had a beginning. What is there which has not had a beginning ? God only. God and creation are, therefore, all that *is* ; God being first, and creation second. But how do we know that creation is second ? By the intuitive law of cause and effect. Under this law, consecutive thought forces us back until we rest in a cause which is first, and unitary, and adequate to the causation of all that *is* outside of this cause ; that is, it forces us to the assumption of God, and to the inference of creation by God. God, therefore, created the universe.

But what is it to create? It is to cause to be or to exist, that is, to have essence, entity, substantiality. The nearest analogon to creating, in human action, is to imagine. To imagine is to confer ideal existence. We construct an ideal castle in the clouds—perfect in proportion, matchless in beauty, something entirely new in the universe. But it does not exist; it has no substance; it is more fleeting than a shadow. So soon as we cease to hold it together by attentive thought, it falls away. God, in creating, does a like thing; he constructs a universe. But his structure is not a mere picture; it is a reality. It is not a subjective ideality projected into space; but it has objective reality. It does not need to be held together by God's attention, lest it fall away. It is not merely constructed in space, like the cloud-castle, but it *occupies* space. In man and his cloud-castle there is but one existence, that of the man himself. In God and his creation there are two existences; otherwise there would be naught but God. The universe, therefore, is not a mere thought *of* God, but a thing brought into being *by* God. It is a thing apart from, outside of, or distinct from, the substance of God; otherwise there would have been no creation—there would be only one pantheistic substance. There would then not be God *and* a universe; there only would be God and no universe, or a universe and no God. But thought, lighted by intuition, proves that there is God *and* a universe. The universe, then, has objective being. God has given it to have entity *in itself*. Once created, it has thereafter reality, in the same sense that God has reality. God *is*, and it *is*. Any other conception of the universe lands us into the infinite absurdity of pantheism.

But this conception being true, some popular expressions are seen at once to be self-contradictory and absurd. It is absurd to say that the universe continues to exist solely because God, by an incessant act of volition, continues to hold it in existence. Such a notion is contrary to the very idea of existence. To exist is to have substantiality. A substance, when once created, no more needs God's active volition to keep it in existence than does a house need the unsleeping volition of its builder to keep it from ceasing to be a house. So it is, also, with individual objects inside of the universe. Trees, men, angels, are not mere thoughts of God, but they are substantialities outside of God. They also have being within themselves. They also do not need to be held into being by an incessant volitional attention of God.

The contrary and more popular view may seem to be the more pious, but the very opposite is the case. It is in fact not only not pious, but it is (unconsciously, of course) pantheistic and blasphemous. It is pantheistic, for it denies reality to created objects. It is blasphemous, because it renders God the real author of sin. If a palsy-legged man can stab his friend only by virtue of my holding him upright, then, if I do so hold him, I am morally and civilly guilty of the stabbing myself. If a man or a devil can lust or hate only by virtue of God's actively holding him in existence at each consecutive moment of the sinning, then the sinning is also God's. In fact, it is exclusively God's; for such a notion of a creature's being incessantly held into existence utterly excludes any real existence of the creature at all. It really implies this, that not only each consecutive moment of the man's, or the devil's existence is directly due to God, but also that each action and part of the action of the man or devil is directly an act of God; for on this hypothesis the creature has no basis, no prop within himself, whereon to give footing to his action. The footing is furnished by God. Let the footing cease to be momentarily furnished, and no lustful or otherwise devilish feeling or thought will ever be possible. Let me guide my son so long as he wants to go where he ought to go, and I am innocent; but let me guide him when he wants to go into crime, and I also am criminal. So, let God hold angels into being so long as they will to act righteously, and no moral objection is discoverable; but let him continue to hold them into being when they begin to will wickedly, and the rationality of his course is no longer apparent.

But this whole notion of holding into existence is exclusive of the very idea of existence. It is a self-contradictory and therefore an impossible thing. To exist is, by the very conception of the thing, to have being within itself. To need to be held into existence is equivalent to the scholastic absurdity of an incessant creation (*creatio continua*), or rather re-creation, of the universe; an absurdity I call it, for the reason that if the universe needs to be created at any one moment, then it was evidently *not* created the moment before; then, also, there is not *one* universe, but only an incessant series of successive, and hence non-identical, universes.

All of which contradictions and absurdities drive us back to our former position: that there are two existences—first, God; and, second,

the universe; the first having existence in himself *per se*, and the second having existence in itself by virtue of *having been* created.

But what, now, *is* the universe? It is the totality of all that *is* except God. It exists, and is unitary, but yet manifold. It has lower and also higher stages. The lower stages are *for* the higher; and yet each stage has a relative worth in itself. The mineral, the flower, the insect, the animal, are not without value *per se*, and yet they are chiefly *for man* as the crowning stage of the universe.

Some of these stages seem to be entirely passive (inorganic nature); some are vital; some are active; some are rationally active. What is God's relation to the universe in these successive stages? We do not fully know. His general relation is that of superintendent, governor, proprietor, modifier. This follows from the very notion of the universe as his created product. But is God the exclusive agent in any of these stages? Yes, if any of the stages are purely passive. In such cases he is both original creator and subsequent modifier. But is he the exclusive agent in unconscious organic life? Is the growing of plants simply the continuous action of God himself, or has he so constituted the realm of vegetation, that it now goes on of itself, except as God sees fit extraordinarily to intervene and modify it? The latter is perhaps the case, though the former view is thought by some to be the more devout. It is not so, however; the latter is both more devout and more worthy of God. Surely, we should not think much of a watch-maker whose watch needed that he should stand by it day and night, and make it go with his finger! A watch ought to go of itself; so also a vegetable kingdom.

But is God the exclusive agent in animals? Hardly. Animals are not purely passive—automatons. They have some degree of liberty. It is even a question as to whether they are not partially superior to a purely dynamic or mechanical action of motives.

But is God the exclusive agent in the realm of rational spirits? All consistently predestinationistic, deterministic, fatalistic systems of theology say, Yes! But all such systems make God the author of sin, and hence are absurd and blasphemous. God is, therefore, not the author of man's acts. He has given to man to have the power of action within himself. His share in man's acts is this: He endowed man with the ability of acting freely of himself; he furnishes, therefore, the instrument; man does the acts.

This discretional freedom of the creature is the acme of creation. In producing free spirits, God created images of himself. In the realm of passivity (crude matter, chemical laws, plants), God intervenes and modifies, by direct dynamic force; in the realm of moral freedom (man, angels), he intervenes and modifies, *through* reason, *by* motives.

Our notion, then, of creation is this: The universe is not a mere phantasm, shadow, or show. It is not a simple exhalation from the bosom of Brahm—not a fleeting wave of delusion over the infinite abyss of naught; it is a solid reality, the first law of whose essence is *persistence in existence*, until its Creator actively intervenes to annihilate it.

V.—THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

NOT long since, there appeared in one of our leading public journals an article on the above-named subject, assuming the negative of the question, and giving, perhaps, the strongest negation that modern infidelity has yet produced. In this paper I shall endeavor to follow the general drift of that article, in so far, at least, as relates to the specific objections stated; and because here I can not give the article itself, I will give its groundwork, by distinctly, and one by one, stating positions on which the argument is made to depend.

No more momentous question can be presented to the human mind than that involving the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. If he did arise, as alleged, nothing in his antecedent history will be found too miraculous for credence—nothing subsequent too strange for universal acceptance. If he did not arise, Christianity is a myth, the sooner the better banished from the world.

OBJECTION I.—DISCREPANCIES.

The first objection is the old, old story of discrepancies in the New Testament narrative concerning the resurrection. It will perhaps avail nothing to say, "This has been answered a thousand times;" it must still be answered again.

Let us attend somewhat particularly to this discrepancy question. What is a discrepancy, and to how much weight is it entitled in making up a verdict on any given question? A discrepancy is an appearance of a mistake in a given statement, when that statement is compared with another proposing, purporting, or claiming to embody the same facts. In order that a discrepancy may vitiate a statement or invalidate an argument, it must be shown that the parts of the statement wherein the discrepancy appears, are necessary to the main question; failing in this, the discrepancy can only cast doubt upon so much of the testimony of *one* witness as is affected by it; it can not affect the entire testimony of even the witness through whose testimony it appears, much less can it affect the testimony of all the witnesses. Suppose, however, all the witnesses are involved either in the same discrepancies, or, which would be stronger for the objector, suppose no two of them agreed precisely in any statement; yet it must be borne in mind that the general tenor of their statements is the same, else there could no discrepancies exist. We beg the reader to bear in mind that we are not now dealing with *contradictories* or *opposites*, but simply with discrepancies; and, in the nature of the case, therefore, there must be some sort of an agreement before discrepancies can appear. This brings us to the test question: Which has a fair preponderance—the discrepancies on the one hand, or the general tenor of the statements on the other? As the author of the article under review takes the liberty of appealing to the reader, in a general way, as to this question, so now do we; and this is our appeal: Concede all the force of objection that can be lodged against the New Testament account of the life of Christ, including his resurrection; select all the discrepancies that can possibly be made to appear; compare them with the great burthen of those narratives, the thousand points of contact where no discrepancies can possibly arise—and as the infidel is confident all will be “vagueness and haziness” to the “discerning reader,” so am I equally confident it will be clear and definite to the discerning reader.

In the foregoing, we have conceded nearly all the objector claims, in respect to the *existence* of these discrepancies. There is yet, however, an important feature to be considered. Many of these so-called discrepancies do not, in fact, exist; they are but “the creation of a morbidly excited fancy” on the part of those who often have reasons

for objecting to the truth of Christianity, which, in their arguments against it, are seldom or never disclosed. I hope this statement will not seem too severe, since the writer of the above quoted words logically bases the faith of all Christians upon "the morbidly excited fancy" of the early disciples of Christ—a compliment (?) that perhaps can not be more gracefully received than by suggesting that possibly these "honest, earnest infidels" are as likely to build their superstructure of unbelief upon a "morbidly excited fancy" as are Christians theirs for belief.

Having now considered the question of discrepancies from the objector's point of view, let us change the current of argument, and show that, in point of fact, discrepancies are all in favor instead of against the truth of the New Testament. Nothing is more commonly known in the department of civil jurisprudence than that testimony, given by different witnesses whose statements too closely resemble each other, is invalidated thereby. It looks like collusion; it casts suspicion of fraud, and really jeopardizes what might have otherwise been a good cause. Circumstantial evidence with a certain direct bearing upon the point at issue, and yet without any thing fixed and stereotyped, ever carries with it a strength and force that never can be reached by the more direct; this, it must be kept in mind, is when several witnesses are giving testimony; this becomes all the more palpable and forcible when it further transpires that the witnesses who testify so directly and positively are *interested* witnesses, have some special reason for desiring to carry their point, and are therefore likely to testify for that purpose.

If ever there was a case made up in the whole world, where impostors or liars, or deceivers of any sort, or even those of "morbidly excited fancy," had need to cling with a death-like grasp to unity and sameness in their statements and testimony, that case was made by those who concluded to cheat the world into the belief that Jesus Christ rose from the dead. That they failed utterly to make their case by way of such direct and uniform testimony as to admit of no question, the ceaseless criticisms of infidels is sufficient proof—proof, indeed, that no such attempt was made. There is but another horn to the dilemma: They attempted to make up their case by the simple statement of it, as it appeared to each, each viewing it from his own point, each bringing his own idiosyncrasies of character and

idioms of speech into his testimony; having done this, each threw his manuscript at the feet of the world, and challenged its criticism for all ages to come. To say this was the work of crafty and designing men is to strangle in the throat nine-tenths of all infidel objection, which, for any vitality, must rest upon the discrepancies of these statements. And to say it was the work of men of "morbidly excited fancy" is to give to such a "fancy" and to such men more power than ever before or since conceded to the best "fancy," or the greatest or grandest of men; for take the whole Christian religion as a mistake or a falsehood, and yet the most stupid of infidels are compelled to admit that no system ever produced such an effect upon the world, and no book has ever provoked the criticism or called forth both admiration and hatred equal to that little New Testament, the work of a few illiterate men of "morbidly excited fancy."

OBJECTION II.—"THOSE WONDERFUL FORTY DAYS."

We next turn our attention to the "forty days." Here our critic is very much astonished that so little of record appears as to what transpired during "those wonderful forty days;" and, further, that it was the duty of Christ to show himself before his enemies, as well as his friends—to appear before all Jerusalem, and thus to settle the question at once and forever as to his identity and divine character. One answer to this the objector anticipates, but fails entirely, as I conceive, to turn aside its force. It is, that Christ, who had performed many miracles before these same Jews—and among them the raising of the dead—could do no more, even if he should show *himself* alive after death; besides, the spirit, whether of this day or that, which would seek to blunt the force of argument by resting the main question on a "morbidly excited fancy," would make the same reply, which would run something like this: A certain man called Jesus has been crucified; yes, we know it. It is rumored he is alive again; we do not believe it. His friends say he is ready to show himself; bring him in, and we will see him. The so-called risen one is produced, when instantly it is declared, Not the man, sir—not the man! Away with him! away with him! we want no impositions here! Why not? The men who had seen all that Christ did before his death, and had still cried out, Away with him! Crucify him! crucify him! would not be likely to deal any less gently with him if he appeared

to them again. The more evident and forcible must this appear, when we remember that for just that very purpose, namely, to get rid of acknowledging his authority, had they put him to death. But, because, as stated, this argument has been anticipated, and, so far as infidelity can accomplish any thing with it, has accomplished it, let us consider the other reasons why Christ did not appear to the public during those forty days.

To give a full answer to this, and one that will be intelligible to all, will require some considerable care, together with a fair knowledge of what I will style the genius of Christ's religion. For the benefit of the general reader, as well as for the unbeliever, we will make some preparatory remarks.

First, let it be observed that Christ's mission was not directly to the world ; had it been, of necessity he must have remained in the world to carry forward his work. I speak of his mission in person. On the contrary, the personal mission of Christ related exclusively to two things : the one to offer an acceptable sacrifice, whereby all pre-existing laws and ceremonies touching a sin-offering might be abolished, and God still be just in justifying the believer ; and the other, to conquer death in the person of a man—or in human nature—and thereby make it possible for all men to escape the power of death. Considered absolutely *per se*, it mattered not whether Christ had any witnesses at all ; the ends accomplished, *per se*, by his life and death, both in respect to human nature and divine law, would have been precisely the same if no human eye had seen him either before his death or after his resurrection. But as a potentiality is worthless until made available, and as even a divine law is inoperative until placed in the hands of a proper executive, so, in order to benefit man by the potentiality disclosed by the life and resurrection of Christ, and thereby give to the race the benefit of a law suited to that divine force, it became necessary for Christ to select and instruct, during his stay on earth, such persons as he desired to intrust with the work of laying before the world the possibilities he had opened to it. It was further necessary that they in turn should instruct the world as to the means of applying all the potentialities of his life, character, death, and resurrection—of applying them in such a way as to make them available in accomplishing for the world just what God had accomplished for Christ.

Secondly, observe the correctness of this position from the following considerations: (1) Christ made no effort while here to carry his mission into various parts of the world; (2) he did not command the preachers he chose at first to preach his name in all the world; (3) on the contrary, he strictly forbade them going to any but Jews—rejecting Samaritans as well as Gentiles; (4) he announced on special occasions, as to the Syrophœnician woman, that he was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; (5) he maintained that position until *after* his resurrection, when, for the first time, he said, Go into all the world; but this he said to others, he did not propose to do it himself.

With these preparations, we are ready to state the main argument: that the real mission of Christ to the world was accomplished by his life, death, and resurrection; and as the business of his apostles was only to take the work when and where he committed it to them, so was it only needful that he should select and qualify those apostles; and so was it only needful that he should manifest himself to them—sufficiently satisfy them of his identity, and give them the evidences of his resurrection. That he did this, is found, not in the fact of their “morbidly excited fancies,” for they had abandoned him on his arrest, denied him at his trial, viewed afar off at his crucifixion, and went back to their fishing after his death! Truly, not of very morbid fancies, nor easily excited, were such men. They, however, did rally again at his call, did hazard all, proclaiming him as the risen One, and sealed their testimony with their lives.

Again, it is no part of the divine system to perform works of supererogation. Even Mr. Darwin thinks that God, if there is a God, does not busy himself with successive creations, but, having established a general law, he leaves the production of the species to the legitimate workings of that law, and the individuals of those species to make the “struggle for life,” with only the assurance of “the survival of the fittest.” Our enemies will certainly not complain if we turn their own weapons against them, or, at least, if we use those they forge and put into our hands.

Here, then, is a law, a principle of operation, selected by divine wisdom, namely, that the divine character and attributes should be illustrated in union with the human; that chosen agents should proclaim this to the world; and that these agents should be man, and

not God. What was Christ doing, then, "those wonderful forty days?" Doing precisely what the Scriptures state: he was with those chosen agents, speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; he was giving them their final instructions for the work they were to perform.

Having now the question answered, let us see if there is any thing extraordinary or unwarranted in such a course of procedure. Before doing this, however, let us take some preparatory steps, which will perhaps enable us to see a little more clearly. Much of the difficulty in the way of the "honest, earnest infidel" has been placed before him, I am sorry to say, by the blunders of the Church; false interpretations, dogmatic creeds, the dicta of councils, these have largely contributed to the doubt and shadow which have been cast over the New Testament; the force of these statements will be seen when I proceed to say that the Church is responsible for so much talk about the "religion" of Christ. Christ did not come into the world to found a religion; he never used the word religion, that we know of. He came into the world to establish a government, or, rather, to re-establish one. At a very early period in the world's history, the nations of the earth revolted—rebelled against God their only rightful ruler, threw off his government, established one of their own, and appointed their own rulers. The last nation to do this was the Jewish. God protested, they persisted; God warned, they disregarded him, and, like the other nations, selected their king. From that day to this, God has been practically ignored and set aside by all the nations of the earth. True, the so-called Christian nations acknowledge him in a general way; but their rulers are very far from laying down their crowns and scepters at his feet, very far from abdicating in his favor. Just here begins the work of Christ—a work of reconstruction, of regeneration. He comes to call back man from his disobedience and rebellion to his allegiance to his Creator. To do this, he establishes, not a religion, a thing to be measured by a few happy feelings while living or dying, *but a GOVERNMENT*. He asks the world to swear allegiance to him as the viceroy of God; he takes the throne at the right hand of God because the genius of his government is to embrace both worlds. At the proper time, as previously shown, he sends out his ministers—ministers plenipotentiary—to invite the world to become his subjects, and at the same time an-

nounce by what means that can be accomplished. He appears after his resurrection only to these, for the reasons shown; and now we ask again, Was there any thing extraordinary or unwarrantable in such a course? The answer is apparent; there was not. On the contrary, it was just the course we should expect him to pursue when we have fully understood the measure and scope of the objects thereby to be accomplished. Let us take a parallel case. Our Government sends her ministers to all the courts of Europe. Sometimes these are ordinary, sometimes extraordinary. Suppose, now, England or Germany should refuse one of these ministers, the proper credentials having been presented, what would be done? Would our Congress go over and argue that point? Would our President appear in person to that recalcitrant court? Suppose that court should say, We do not believe you have any President, nor will we till we see him, what still would be done? The answer is quite apparent. Some words not differing very much from Christ's words concerning unbelievers would likely be used, and that government, if not "damned" forever in the eyes of ours, would be at least until it repented, and made due reparation for the insult offered. Shall, now, earthly governments excel in decorum the heavenly? Shall mortals be more just than God?

Suppose, however, it be objected that this is not a parallel case, inasmuch as the one is an earthly affair, and has to do with technical and legal civil government, while the other claims to be heavenly, and has to do with the souls of men. We reply, first, that we have already been at pains to guard against such an objection by showing that Christ came to establish a government, and not a religion; and that, secondly, therefore, he has virtually to do with the control of human action, and should be expected to pursue in the main such a course in the formation and execution of his law as would be approved by the best and most considerate judgment of mankind. If we add to this—what perhaps would be denied by the infidel, and yet that which seems well-nigh self-evident—that the best human governments themselves are the best because they most nearly approach the models of the divine, we shall not only have the groundwork for the parallelism I have named, but it might be extended to a dozen more of particulars where the governments of men, in their best forms, run parallel with, are similar to, in fact are copied from, the government of Christ. Once rid the world and the Church of the almost monstrous, and

certainly utterly groundless, notion that religion, so-called, is a whim or creature of the emotions, a something to feel happy over now and then, a thing tested mainly by a sensuous appeal, a thing to be "got" or "lost" or "revived" by the ordinary processes of "working up the feelings;" rid the world and the Church of all such groundless and unworthy notions; plant instead the true conceptions of Christ's purposes with the world and his clearly expressed mode of carrying them out—and infidelity will have lost the main spoke in its wheel, and the Bible will have been rid of the chief in importance, and almost all in number, of the objections that are now so assiduously urged against it. In a word, the chief diet of infidelity is found in the incongruities and contradictions of the various *theologies* of the day, by transferring their assumed truth to the Bible, and thenceforward holding the Bible, instead of the theologies, responsible for these differences.

We will give but one more argument concerning the work of the apostles. The forty-day question we have answered. We have in turn one to ask, as follows: If all be conceded that is claimed concerning the excited fancy of the apostles generally, what cause can we assign for finding the apostle Paul ultimately the chief of the apostles? Here is something of the historic argument which, it seems to me, utterly overthrows the entire objection under consideration.

First, it is claimed on the infidel side, and we are gravely informed, that "the great body of the most learned critics hold that Jesus was resurrected only in the minds of his disciples;" (who are these critics?) secondly, it is claimed that "his appearances were the creations of a morbidly excited fancy;" and, third, that Paul was the greatest of all the apostles. Now, I am curious to know how these statements correspond. There may be some force in the argument that men intensely prejudiced *in favor* of another may be led astray by their zeal, or may impute fanciful attributes to their hero. But what of Paul? He was not a disciple of Christ; his name is not even mentioned in connection with Christ's during his personal ministry; and, when first mentioned, he stands before us as one of the most zealous and unrelenting persecutors of those who were believing in that name.

What works so sudden and momentous a change? What transforms the mad zealot of a religion hallowed by centuries, and the most splendid traditions that ever gathered around any people on the earth,

at once into an equally bold proclaimer of the doctrine he labored to destroy? Was this imagination? Was this an excited fancy? Certainly, our interlocutor will say, there is the same claim of an "appearance," the same pretense that Christ "appeared" to Saul, as to the others. But, we reply, the cases are not similar; if any force can be drawn from this plea, it must be on the ground of friendship, of prejudice *in favor* of one, as already shown. To say that an openly avowed enemy of a given person can at once be transformed into a most determined friend, this only by an "appearance" of that person to the enemy, and that "appearance" a work only of a morbid fancy, is certainly quite a stride in the laws and principles of testimony, and infidels have but to establish the correctness of the principle, in order to obtain "letters patent" to the most wonderful discovery of this or any other age. Such doctrine would stultify all common sense, would overturn every received principle of evidence, would vitiate every law by which either the innocent could be acquitted or the guilty condemned, and, in the language of a learned writer, we would have "the most prodigious causes and the most insignificant effects," but "now the case is just reversed."

It need only be added that the whole life of Paul, the history he created, the circumstances under which he became the chief figure in the foreground of the picture, the influences of his doctrine upon the world, reaching over more centuries and permeating higher orders of society than that of any man before or since, the distinctly avowed and oft-repeated declaration by himself, that he received all from this same Jesus Christ—these are indeed the "Ossa on Pelion," not of "improbabilities," but of moral certainties; the "Olympus," whose height, thus far, no infidels have scaled, and against whose base of truth, firmer than adamantine walls, their shafts have found "bloodless sheaths."

OBJECTION III.—"NO CAUSES ADEQUATE FOR THE SCENES OF PENTECOST."

The next feature of the article before us worthy of note is the interpretation of the scenes of Pentecost. During the life of Christ "we had the most prodigious causes and the most insignificant effects;" "now the case is just reversed," says our objector; that is, on Pentecost we have the most insignificant causes and the most

stupendous effects. This may be a satisfactory statement to an unbeliever, but we think it will bear investigation a little. First, what are the causes at work in each case? During Christ's personal ministry, as already shown, no effort was made to attract the attention of the world at large; not a passage of Scripture in the New Testament, not a principle in Christ's government, can be adduced to remove the truth of that position. His miracles were performed without ostentation, and his good works without trumpet heraldry. He associated mainly with the humbler classes, and confined the greater part of his labors to personal benefits and blessings. He even prohibited the recipients of his favor from telling it abroad. If his miracles were called in question, or his motives impugned, with rare exceptions, he neither made explanation nor defense, and, when called upon by the curious or the proud to give some sign of his divine character, he utterly refused. To the Scribe and Pharisee—the ruling classes, the aristocracy of the Jewish Church—he spoke in terms of unmeasured condemnation and rebuke, and, with a single exception, never betrayed the slightest concern as to what men thought of him or said about him; and even in that exception, when he asked his disciples who men said he was, the sequel justifies us in believing he did it simply and only to elicit a reply from them on which he would base, or make the occasion of laying down, one of his most fundamental principles. Now, before any infidel can become excited over “prodigious causes,” he must candidly inquire into all the relations of those causes, into their logical character as to “effects,” into just the nature of the effects that these or those particular causes are expected to produce, effects that we can expect will logically follow from them. With such a comprehensive view of the case, I do not hesitate to say that the course Christ pursued was by no means calculated to produce prodigious effects; in truth, when we subject the whole bearing of his conduct toward the ruling classes of his day to a keen and rigid analysis; and when we remember *that he refused to disclose to his own chosen apostles* the main and final principles of his government, and finally left them without doing it; when we remember, too, that he refused to give them power or authority to go on with their works, but commanded them to wait indefinitely and in his *absence* for it; when we gather up all these leading, and, in a question of cause and effect, determining facts, the

wonder is, indeed, not that such "insignificant effects" crowned Christ's earthly work; the wonder is he had a single disciple to his name when Pentecost came. But now the scene changes; the facts are of another class, the causes of another character; and we have now a right to look for the very "stupendous" effects which followed.

First of all, we must remind the infidel that there were at least ten days, after the "wonderful forty days," quite as wonderful as they. These ten days afforded ample opportunity for either that stolid indifference as to, or close scrutiny into, the question of the resurrection of Christ, which the infidel thinks—and for the argument we will grant rightly thinks—characterized the people of Jerusalem during this period—a period of masterly inactivity or rigid scrutiny. We may suppose it was both; that is, that some would treat the whole question as unworthy their attention, while others would investigate and decide. We may further concede too, that, having done this, each went his own way, thinking nothing, caring nothing further, about this singular Nazarene. These fifty days afforded ample opportunity for reaching such a mental condition throughout Jerusalem and as much of Judea and Galilee as had heard of the alleged works of Christ. This being done, there was no reason it should be changed. The once turbulent elements of Jewish society are now tranquil. The burning ambitions of a few, and the wild *pro et con* speculations of the many, have become evenly tempered, and all is placid as an infant's sleep. It must remain so, logically, philosophically, necessarily; so far as the Nazarene is a disturbing element, it must remain so. He has disappeared; his friends do not know where he is; his enemies do not care where he is; from the presence of both he has vanished; his words no longer, if true, can soothe the sorrowing; if false, enrage the overpious; his "appearances" even no longer disturb nor excite "the morbid fancies" of his followers; he is gone—gone forever. But "suddenly"—the right word in the right place—suddenly—this is the word with which the introduction of the new class of causes and effects is made—suddenly there came a sound from heaven. Neither time nor space, nor the need of the question, will require us to consider the phenomena of Pentecost in detail. We are to look for causes and trace their effects, to see if we have the most "insignificant" of the former, and most "stupendous" of the latter.

Let it be remarked, to begin with, then, that the sudden appearance again of these disciples of Christ, after the fifty days had apparently settled the question forever, was itself a fact that neither Jewish society nor faithful historians could ignore or overlook. The fact, too, that they appeared as the fearless and determined preachers of Christ, far bolder now that they have Christ's shadow—and that only by a "morbid fancy," according to "the great body of the most learned critics"—than they were when in person he was with them, was also a cause of no mean character; and the fact that the hearers on the occasion could in no way account for the appearance and preaching of these men, except upon the twofold ground of Christ's actual resurrection, and therefore their own guilt, must, of necessity, lead to more marked results than any thing which had previously occurred.

If the last step in the above argument be called in question, let the objector simply make up a parallel case for modern times, and inquire upon what other principle could those men have been persuaded to engage in that Pentecost preaching, and the objection will fall of its own weight. To say they were deluded, as has already been shown, is of no force beyond the first few days of the alleged resurrection; to say they were insincere contradicts their whole after life; and to say they are ambitious of place and power, regardless of the mode of obtaining it, would be equivalent to writing them down even too great fools to become successful knaves. The ambitions of life are builded on some more substantial things than morbid fancies and excited imaginations. The first Napoleon does not imagine there is a France, and then seek her diadem; he *knows* France is, then fights for her crown. No more stupid stultification of common sense, no more stupendous falsification of all history, can be made, than to assert that the apostles of Christ on this day of Pentecost were the victims, either of mental hallucination, stolid ignorance, or crafty and reckless ambition.

But another very great difference between Pentecost and any previous occasion. Whatever crimes the Jews might have been guilty of committing against Christ, such as rejecting his claims, scoffing at his teaching, trifling with his truth, *et id genus omne*, they were but once guilty of putting him to death. However, under his or his apostles' lashings, they may have quivered, or their consciences re-

coiled, they were yet in condition to plead a partial extenuation of their conduct, on the ground that Christ was yet living, and perhaps, after all, they were not worse than other men. But now Christ dies—dies at their hands, with no legal charge against him—for the cowardly Pilate washes his hands of the whole matter—and dies, too, under the, on their part, special invocation that his blood be upon their heads.

Here is a culmination of events. Men must be hardened wretches, indeed, who can put a fellow being to death with no compunctions, with no after-thought of the dreadful crime. They may—these men probably did—put it from their thoughts for a short time; but it is “a ghost that will not down;” and when, after fifty days of apparent quiet, all Jerusalem is suddenly filled with an uproar, and the people go rushing with one accord into the Temple to discern the occasion, the climax of causes is reached. They hear these same fishermen, with a boldness that knows no quailing, not only reaffirming their faith in the Nazarene, not only preaching, in the most positive and confident manner, his resurrection, but charging home to the hearts of the crowd that they were his murderers. A crisis is reached; these men know that they have put that same Jesus to death; they know that they are now publicly charged with it; they know that there are but two modes of escape—the one to refute the claim that he is risen, and thereby, if not escape the fact they did kill *a mán*, at least escape the terrible crime of having killed their own Messiah; the other, to frankly acknowledge their crime, and ask how they can escape the consequences. They chose the latter. To say they did this prematurely; to say they were under undue excitement; to say their fancies were morbidly excited, and that the phenomena of Pentecost were only delusive appearances; to say that it was just an easy method of getting rid of the speakers of the occasion; in a word, to say they had not a most comprehensive and thorough view of the whole case, and acted upon that view, is to suppose, to put it most mildly, that men in that age had a very unaccountable method of action? No; the truth must force itself upon the attention of every candid reader, that Pentecost was not only and simply a display of a few singular phenomena, accompanied by a short speech by the apostle Peter, but it was the climax, the grand summing up, of a tremendous series of causes, each one in its place, having its own peculiar force and significance, but all combined and centered on one point, and that one

point the resurrection of Christ. This, done by men who fifty days before had surrendered their "fancies" and gone back to their nets and their fishing; this, done in the open light of Jerusalem, in the opening of one of their most splendid national occasions; this, done with the representatives of all civilized nations present to witness it; this, done in behalf of a man alleged by the Jews to be dead, whose dead body could at any moment have been produced if—indeed, he were dead; and this, done not for the moment, but for all time—not for Jerusalem, but for the world—all this forms the culmination of those "prodigious causes" from which we have, on Pentecost, the right to expect—nor do we expect in vain—the most stupendous effects.

OBJECTION IV.—"CONCESSIONS OF PROFESSOR FISHER, PASCAL,
AND OTHERS."

The only points farther, in the article under review, that I desire to notice, are the writer's reference to certain authors—Professor Fisher, the reviewer of Maurice, Pascal, etc. I might here urge that Christianity is under no obligations to answer such objections, on the ground that they lie really against theology instead of the New Testament, as I have previously shown; yet not to seem to seek to avoid any issue, let us briefly examine what there may be in them. First, of Professor Fisher's statement, that a certain state of preparation of heart is necessary, or the "evidence" will not be found sufficient. This is true, or not true, as one applies the words; but in so far as it is true in its widest sense, it is equally true of any other book as well as the New Testament—of any other subject as well as Christianity. There are certain laws of evidence, certain principles, under whose workings no testimony will take effect, or all true testimony will take effect. Professor Fisher knows this as well as any other man, and his critic ought to, or not quote from his works. If, for example, a man come to the New Testament with his mind already made up to find this or that particular doctrine, he will be quite sure to find it—find the most satisfactory evidence to sustain it. If, on the other hand, a man approach the Bible with the intent of overthrowing its claims, he will be sure to find the evidence of its truth unsatisfactory. If the habits and practices of a man are condemned by the Bible, and he still desire to indulge those habits, such a one will certainly find the evidence not satisfactory; even so, if a man,

long supposing himself a believer in the Bible, is suddenly aroused to find the practices of his Church quite at variance with the Bible, he will be as likely to begin to call the Bible in question as his Church, such being the force of Church tradition and early teaching. In all these cases, and in others that might be named, no one need call in question Professor Fisher's statement, or be troubled by it. But the true test of evidence is its effect upon an unprejudiced, unprepossessed mind. All civilized governments recognize this: a jurymen is questioned as to his knowledge or opinions in the case now to be tried; if his mind is already occupied, he is dismissed, and another called to his place. The Bible, though of God, is a book, and, as a book, is subject to the same rules of inspection as other books. The testimony concerning Christ, though pointing to extraordinary facts, is, nevertheless, human testimony, and must be tried by the same rules, and certainly has the same rights, as testimony in any modern court. What, then, is the answer to this question? Approach the New Testament testimony with a mind ready to receive simple truth, no matter what that truth may be, or where it will lead, and the fact that, in spite of all the vigorous efforts of infidelity to overthrow it, the New Testament has survived eighteen centuries, and in the light and knowledge of the nineteenth has more reverent believers in it than ever before, is a sufficient answer.

Concerning that "English divine," Pascal, and others, I have only to remark, that they reflect that particular sentiment which is the legitimate outgrowth of their theology, and would be as likely to give up the "historic argument," or "cleave to metaphysics," as Darwin would cling to "the survival of the fittest" doctrine, or Tyndall cleave to physics without the *meta*. And why this? From the very evident reason, as already shown, that no system of theology as such can be maintained by the Bible. And men, whether great or small, whether the immortal Pascal or the mortal John Smith, who mistake their own dogmata for pure Christian doctrine or New Testament evidence will be sure to think a change of base necessary with respect to that doctrine or evidence, whenever their favorite dogmas have been shaken or removed out of the way. The fact is not to be disguised, that most of theological effort, since the Reformation by Luther, has been wasted on words and names, instead of being directed to the development of the Christian life. It must, further, be frankly conceded that

infidelity has gained great advantage thereby; so much that it, mistaking the chaff for the wheat, is really supposing the whole fabric of Christianity about to fall into a shapeless and irretrievable mass of ruins. Nothing of the sort. The hot fires through which it is passing will only serve to consume the rubbish, and leave the imperishable temple only the more glorious for the fiery ordeal through which it proves itself capable of passing.

OBJECTION V.—“THE HISTORY MAY NOT, IT MUST, BE TRUE.”

A word now about the “*may*” and “*must*” of truth. Of the history of Christ’s resurrection, our objector says, the apologist has only shown that “it *may* be true;” and demands, therefore “it *must* be true;” and adds, “There is all the difference in the world between *may* and *must*.”

To this I reply with two answers: First, it depends entirely upon circumstances whether a thing “*must* be true” or not. If infidel objectors—especially those who sail under the garb of much learning—will give a little heed to the relative character of words, they will find that, in most cases demanding proof, the probability is all that can be reached, no matter who or what authority demands more. If by “*must*,” therefore, we mean that all pertinent probabilities, that is, all that bear on the case at all, “*must*” bear in its favor, then it is simply impossible to prove any thing true whatever, except the few facts that can be made tangible to our senses; and even then *illusions* and *collusions* will be so imminent, and, when present or practiced, so potent, that a careful man full of honesty would hesitate to testify positively to any thing.

Secondly, I reply that, by such a rule, no great historic fact in any department can ever be established. I ask an infidel, for instance, who wrote the plays usually called Shakespeare; he answers, perhaps with astonishment, Shakespeare, of course. I ask, Can you prove that by the facts of history, beyond *any* doubt? He is an ignoramus of quite pure water who would answer that in the affirmative. But if I even ask, Can you prove it beyond any *reasonable* doubt? still any man read in modern controversy would hesitate to answer yes. What would he answer? what *must* he answer? Something like the following: I can prove to my own satisfaction, and I think to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind, the authorship in question;

and of all the probabilities that bear on it, I can certainly show the great preponderance in my favor. And is this all? Certainly all; and certainly all that can be said of any event in any thing at least like the remote past. "

Upon general principles, let me further remark, that every infidel destroys, in the very outset, the validity of his argument against the historic narrative in question. Does he ask why? Because he quotes contemporaneous history and gives it a force he denies to the other; he quotes equally remote records with the New Testament to overthrow its records; accords to the alleged counter-statements full truth as the means of establishing the lack of truth in the point at issue. Suppose, now, the fronts are changed; suppose I say that before any ancient writer can be received against the New Testament writers, their writings are to be proved true—no "*may*" about it, I insist they "*must* be true"—where, now, will the objector stand?

But again I remark that the contents of a book, as to whether they do or do not please the fancy, or cater to the passions of a man, have very much to do in deciding his faith in that book. Take, for example, the eager haste with which some few phases of modern science have been snatched after, because of some supposed contradiction of the Bible; see with what hot speed such comets and meteors in the moral heavens as Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley, Proctor, *et id genus omne*, have been run after, because it was supposed they had found the charmed Eldorado—the real fountain of life; with what ease men gulped down the monstrous camels of "development," "survival of the fittest," "matter the potency of life," the age of the world, the exact time to fill the delta of a river, or wear away the rock of Niagara; observe with what a pliant and easy knee the whole infidel school have bowed to testimony, which, if it had no other objection, is new and crude—but add thereto testimony brought forward by a few men at the very threshold of a science, and by men who are yet almost totally disagreed among themselves touching some of the most vital points in their respective theories. Take note of all this; compare it with the testimony which, however vulnerable, has at least the credit of eighteen hundred years' standing, and the credit of being stereotyped, so that it can not be one thing to-day, and, by way of evasion, another thing to-morrow; add to this that the narrative in question is the only one that even makes a decent pretense at the unfolding of

the future for man—and surely we think that, though “every now and then a bolder foot oversteps the boundary forever,” the “bolder feet” will lead but few astray. And, as time moves on, and men become better acquainted with themselves, with each other, understand better the stupendous capabilities with which they are endowed, instead of overstepping the only border land of faith that can disclose the eternal, instead of closing the ear to the only voice that ever echoed back the cry of victory over death, instead of turning away from the only leader who ever passed the gateway of the grave to bring back the light of life and immortality from the shadows of eternal night—instead of these, men will cleave to the Crucified; yea, to the Risen One; cleave to him as their only Hope and Redeemer; cleave to him living; cleave to him dying; and find at length eternity only sufficient to render him, with the Father, the homage due their great and glorious names.

VI.—THE INSTABILITY OF SCIENCE, AND THE INCOMPARABLE STABILITY OF THE BIBLE.

AMONG the points alluded to in my article, in the January number of the *QUARTERLY*, is that the Drift formation is the most superficial geological deposit of the pre-Adamic ages. This proposition was postulated upon the assumption that the geological textbooks are correct. But, as the time when the cataclysm occurred is in dispute, it seems necessary to examine the matter further; for upon an elucidation of the subject depends the credibility of another proposition or two—the antiquity of man on the one hand, and the recent origin of the human race on the other—another battle-field upon which modern Agamemnons are measuring their steel.

As these subjects will be examined more in detail by and by, we will turn immediately to notice the subject in hand.

THE INSTABILITY OF SCIENCE.

Darwinism, Lamareckian evolution, etc., although quite ancient in their inception, have been resurrected from the tomb of the past by

keen, shrewd scientists ; newly vamping and environing their subjects with drapery so attracting as to confound, bewilder, and allure myriads into their faith. The danger, if any, does not arise from the bold, arrogant speculations of atheistic scientists, but, rather, from the smooth and polished theistic believers, and teachers of science, who hold to evolution theories. Diabolos of old was a capital lay preacher, endowed with the gift of speech, and familiar with the Scriptures. By his seductive speech and apt quotation he captivated the denizens of Paradise, and wrought a world of mischief. There are apt lay preachers at the present time. Buchanan, speaking of physical evolution, wrote, as long ago as 1859, "that if it were established, it would not follow from this, as a necessary consequence, that the peculiar evidence of theism would be thereby destroyed, or even diminished."

Dr. Winchell says :

"But suppose the old doctrine of specific creations to become untenable, and the doctrine of a genealogical succession and connection of organic beings to be established in its place ; suppose it is convincingly proven, by and by, that man is descended from a monkey or an ascidian or a monad: what have we to say?"

I have to say, in reference to this matter, that there are no reasons for alarm on the subject ; for God is the author of the realms of nature, as well as the author of the Bible, and his Word and works will forever harmonize. But let us hear him again.

"Now, as no person can believe that two necessary truths will ever appear in conflict with each other, it necessarily follows that these religious beliefs can never be successfully impugned, and that we may fold our arms and smile placidly at any movements of science which seem to be directed against them. Suppose, then, the time should come when we should feel bound, by the dictates of reason and of science, to accept the doctrine of the derivative evolution of organic types, would that necessarily subvert any fundamental doctrine which we have received from our sacred Scriptures ? We answer, deliberately and confidently, No ; and we will define, in brief, the grounds on which we stand : First. The authority of those Scriptures has been fully vindicated by the revelations of history, language, ethnology, archæology, and science ; and we have *a priori* ground for asserting that their veracity will continue to be vindicated. Second. If, then, they are the utterances of God's truth, they must harmonize with any other utterances of God's truth. But we do not rely solely upon these abstract, deductive propositions. We bring the specific points of comparison directly into the light of investigation, and demand, what must follow from the established fact, that the admitted developmental succession of organic types has been realized through the operation of secondary causes. When we look the problem squarely in the face, we smile in

amazement that it has seemed necessary to propound it. Is it less credible that man as a species should have been developed by secondary causes from an ape, than that by such means man as an individual should rise from a new-born babe or a primitive ovum? It is no more derogatory to man's dignity to have been, at some former period, an ape, than to have been that red lump of mere flesh which we call a human infant. And if the means by which the babe has developed into a man do not, to the common mind, seem to exclude Deity from the process, why should we feel that Deity is necessarily excluded from a similar process in leading man up from the monkey? No reason can be assigned. (?) If you say that the babe is the man in potentiality, so may it be replied that the monkey is the man in potentiality—and so the quadruped, the reptile, or the fish. It does not exclude divine agency from the work of organic advancement to assume that it has been effected through the reproductive and other physiological processes. The Creator no less made man if he caused him to be derived by descent from an orang-outang. Man's structural organism stands in a relation of affinity to that of the monkey, which is rendered no more intimate or absolute by the admission that they belong to the same genealogical tree; and man's intellectual and moral superiority is just as emphatic and distinguishing, and just as much a divine in-breathing, as if it were the crowning grace of an organism which could not illustrate one plan and one intelligence, in the whole creation. If specific types come into being derivatively, the utmost that can be said is that this was the divine method of creating.

"We can not logically hesitate to entertain similar views in reference to the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, or, more accurately, of archegenesis. Shall it be proven that organization comes forth from certain forms and conditions of dead matter, we shall simply say that this is the divine method of creating. And when we can finally look upon the living, conscious, moving being rising above the horizon of existence, we shall feel awed at the spectacle, and acknowledge ourselves brought into the nearer, visible presence of Creative Divinity.

"All we seek is the truth. All truth is God's truth; and the most devout act is the hearty acceptance of truth. So thought the theist of antiquity, who, like Anaxagoras, Pliny and Plutarch, held to the evolution of certain forms of life from dead matter. So thought the priests of the Middle Ages, who held, with the philosophers, that many of the simple forms of animals and plants were generated directly from earthy slime and fermenting substances. So thought Moses, apparently, when he wrote, in speaking of the first appearance of vegetation, that 'the earth brought forth grass;' and when, in speaking of the advent of marine creatures and terrestrial animals, that 'the waters brought them forth,' and 'the earth brought them forth.' As if to render it intelligible that this method of creation does not preclude the idea of God, the historian tells us that '*God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature . . . and it was so.*' *That*, then, was God's method of creating. This seems like the best evidence we have in support of the doctrine of archegenesis."

I have quoted thus copiously from Dr. Winchell's "Doctrine of Evolution," because it is *multum in parvo*, and contains a fair statement of the evolution theory, and the best defense that has been, or can be, made for it. This, then, is Darwinism as it now is. These

are the themes, this the logic, with which we have to contend. Here the propositions are stated, and the smooth, seductive arguments given, and quotations artfully made from the sacred text in proof of the same.

Notwithstanding the broad platform of evolution is acknowledged to be, by its best advocates, an unproved problem, a speculation, yet it is so skillfully argued that it is calculated to deceive the very elect if possible. Let us look at the issues involved for a short time. The leading thought in the above quotation is, that man descends by evolution from a monkey or an ascidian or a monad. The Bible declares that the "kinds," or species, are fixed, and do not run into one another. "Let the land grow grass, herb yielding seed, fruit tree bearing fruit *after its kind*." (Genesis i, 11.) Here the theory of new species of plants being developed from another is most emphatically denied. "Then God said, Let the waters abound with the crawler that hath breath and life, and let fowl fly above the earth, upon the face of the expanse of the skies. Then God created the great fishes and every living, breathing thing that creepeth, with which the waters abounded *after their kind*, and every bird of wing *after its kind*." (Genesis i, 20, 21.) "Let the waters abound with the crawler that hath breath and life;" or, as in the Hebrew, "shall creep, teem, swarm with the creeping thing."

The first definition given to the Hebrew word מין (*min*) by Gesenius is "species." The word used in the current translation is "kind." Dr. Winchell asks, "Is it less credible that man as a species should have been developed by secondary causes from an ape, than that by such means man as an individual should rise from a new-born babe or a primitive ovum?" Not at all, if it had been God's plan of operation; but his expressed plan is, "Let every thing bring forth *after its kind*," or species. Webster says a species is, "A *permanent* class of existing things, or beings, associated according to attributes, or properties which are determined by scientific observation." Dr. Winchell further says: "It is no more derogatory to man's dignity to have been, at some former period, an ape, than to have been that red lump of mere flesh which we call a human infant. And if the means by which the babe has developed into a man do not, to the common mind, seem to exclude Deity from the process, why should we feel that Deity is necessarily excluded from a similar process in leading man

up from the monkey?" Simply because it is God's plan that every animal and plant "shall bring forth *after its kind*," or species. Suppose Dr. Winchell should take a young monkey and feed it upon milk-porridge, and I should take a new-born male human infant and feed it on the same; which do you think would first be developed into a man?

Dr. Winchell tells us that "Anaxagoras, Pliny, and Plutarch held to the evolution of certain forms of life from dead matter." And so do some modern knights hold the same doctrine—that from the decaying carcass of a defunct swine innumerable vermicula are evolved. His argumentation is ingenious and persuasive; but the major premise of his proposition is false. His proposition is, "that man is developed from a monkey." There is not an example in the archives of our planet showing that man ever was evolved from a monkey, or any thing else but a primitive ovum. This whole doctrine is antagonized by the statements in the eleventh, twentieth, and twenty-first verses of Genesis i: "Let the earth grow grass;" "let the waters crawl with the crawlers;" the verb and noun having the same root. The waters are not the cause, but the element, of the fish, as the air is of the fowl, and the ground of the grass, herb, and tree. But, in the face of all this, we are told that "we may admit all that Darwin teaches, and yet do no violence to the Sacred Text."

Evolution, as now taught and advocated, to say the best for it we can, is but scientific speculation; and, in all probability, in two or three decades of years it will present a front so different as to be scarcely recognizable by its present advocates, for such is the

FICKLENESS OF SCIENCE,

as we will now proceed to notice.

In 1815, Lamarck published his great "*Histoire des Animaux sans Vertèbres*," in which he advocated the theory of the "Variation of Species." Some years ago, Mr. Lyell wrote a refutation of the book and the theory; but subsequently revived the theory and advocated it. He is a conscientious physicist, though, like other men, liable to err. Mr. Lyell, it is said, "has also greatly modified his views with reference to the phenomena and date of the Glacial Period." He has deducted at least one-half from his former computation, and within a

short time past he has been "compelled to recast his nomenclature of the Pliocene and Post-pliocene Ages."

These oscillations up and down the scale geological should admonish us that the most learned and cautious students of the natural record are liable to misinterpret the text, and that the instability of science is too apparent to admit of ultimate conclusions.

Until recently, geologists taught that the earth was originally in a condition of igneous fluidity—the theory of a central heat universally obtained. But now we are taught by Sir Charles Lyell that the increase of heat as we descend into the earth may be explained "without the necessity of our appealing to an original central heat, or the igneous fluidity of the central part of the earth." And yet we are assured by Professor Dana "that the facts of geology leave little room for doubt that the earth was once in fusion, and has been through all time a cooling globe." Professor Hitchcock and others affirm that "previous to the formation of the lowest solid rocks the whole globe was in a state of igneous fusion." It is evident, therefore, that science is considerably unsettled and often in error; that the opinions current to-day, are, in a great many cases, not the opinions of a few years to come; and that "pre-eminent for instability among all the sciences is geology." May it not, therefore, turn out that man is not descended from an ape, and that the Mosaic chronology is nearer the truth than that of Dr. Dawler or Sir Charles Lyell, who, a few years since, said the Glacial Age reached back eight hundred thousand years, which he now says is only two hundred thousand? In all probability, the next issue will record that the Drift Period can not be beyond six or seven thousand years, which will make the Mosaic chronology at least credible.

The quotations we have made show that in many instances man has gained less than he supposed. Not every apparent advance has been real. The approved science of to-day often discredits the science of by-gone days. Notwithstanding this, progress, in every age, has been made; and, notably in modern times, science has cleared itself of false methods of operation, and much speculation has been culled out, leaving the gems of ascertained fact.

Science is knowledge well arranged; before its voice every one must bow. But the line between science and speculation must be drawn by a clear head. Science takes nothing for granted. Science

must be assured of its data, and must be certain that it is in possession of all the data; facts and phenomena are not reached by induction, but only general truths. The facts and phenomena must be under actual observation. From facts and phenomena, general truths arise and are established, and from these we come to safe conclusions regarding the processes of nature. Hence, the man who undertakes to account for the origin of species, and the descent of man, from phenomena which belong only to the modification of species, is unscientific.

Scientists are disposed to discredit all belief that is not founded upon scientific experiment and analysis. This, however, is not true; for man's mental constitution is such as to enable him to believe on grounds of analysis and demonstration, and also upon testimony. Reliable testimony demands credence, as well as scientific demonstration. The world abounds with things we can never know only upon testimony. The rings of Saturn can be observed by only a few of the inhabitants of the earth; the great majority receive the facts on the testimony of those who have had access to the telescope. The great facts concerning man's origin and destiny we must obtain through testimony—divine testimony. "The world, by wisdom, knew not God." Nor can the scientist, by analyzing natural phenomena, find him out in modern times. This knowledge must be received upon divine testimony. The Bible is the only witness. Is it credible? It comes down to us, through the ages, unscarred and unscathed by the fiery darts hurled against it for thousands of years. And to-day it has a stronger hold upon the faith of man, and, consequently, is more impregnable, than in any previous age. He who attempts to solve the problem of the origin of the universe—of man's origin and destiny—by scientific analysis, will utterly fail, and that without remedy.

We have briefly noticed a few of the facts and arguments showing the instability of science and scientist; we wish now to ask attention to what may be said concerning the

INCOMPARABLE STABILITY OF THE BIBLE.

The stability and invulnerability of the Bible may be inferred from the results of the attacks made upon it in the ages past by deistic and atheistic critics and scientists.

From the dawn of science until now, new discoveries have been made from time to time ; and every new system and every new opinion in philosophy and science has been compared with the teachings of the Bible ; and when any seeming discrepancy has been discovered, it has been compelled to give battle. It has been aptly said, that "any knight who may please to wind his horn at its castle-gates can summon it out to maintain its cause ;" and, if it should fail in a single instance, all is lost. For many centuries this has been the case, and still is. Far back in the days of the Cæsars, it had to encounter the learning of that time—the traditions and memories of Egyptian civilization, science, and art ; and, if possible, farther back, to the days of Zoroaster and his doctrine of the causation of cosmical matter and astronomical phenomena. It had to contend with the teachings of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle ; with the philosophy and logic of Celsus ; the learning and criticisms of Porphyry, whose life was mainly spent in writing against the Bible. By Tacitus, and Pliny the younger, it is called "a crooked and immoderate superstition." Hence, the Bible had to contend with the learning of that age of the world in which the Pyramids were produced, "the temples of Thebes, the Vendidad, the Vedas, the Parthenon, the Apollo Belvidere, the astronomy and the arts of Egypt and Babylon, the works of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Epictetus." And in modern times it has to contend with the animadversions of Huxley, Tyndall, Lubbock, Lyell, Grote, Mill, Spencer, Tennyson, Vogt, Büchner, and other scientists. And as the Milesian philosopher, Anaximander, taught, nearly six hundred years before the Christian era, that "men were born of earth and water mixed, and heated by the beams of the sun," what more do modern scientists, when they teach that man is derived, by evolution, from a monad ? The Bible has not only encountered the bold attacks made by scientists, but a more subtle class, who come under the head of philosophers and critics ; among whom we may mention Polition, Ficinus, Poggio, Cardinal Bembo, Averroes, Lord Herbert, Hobbes, and Spinoza. And in the transitional period, between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, we may mention Toland and Shaftesbury. To these we may add Woolston, Paulus, Dr. Tindal, Morgan, Bolingbroke, Hume, Voltaire, Helvetius, Rousseau, Condillac, the founder of the French materialistic philosophy. Gibbon and Paine followed suit ; Cabanis and Volney, Semler, Eichhorn, Kant,

Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, De Wette, and Strauss. All these illustrious personages, with might and main, hurled their materialistic, deistic, and atheistic "boomerangs" against the Sacred Text; but, missing the mark, the missiles returned to fall at the feet of the manipulators. The history of the labors of these men will show with what inconsiderate haste scientists often promulgate new theories. All these attacks on the Bible have failed. The men who made and pursued them are nearly all forgotten. While the Bible holds stronger sway over the minds and consciences of more men now than at any previous time.

The following sketch from "*La Bible et la Science Moderne*," by M. Pouchaud, will serve to show how evanescent are the speculations and theories of man:

"Depuis l'époque de Buffon les systemes se sont élevés les uns à côté des autres en si grand nombre, qu'en 1806 l'Institut de France comptait plus de quatre-vingts théories hostiles aux Saintes Ecritures. Aucune n'est restée debout jusqu'à ce jour."

And while these eighty theories were permitted to pass unattacked by logicians of theistic belief, they essayed to wear the habiliments of science; but, as soon as the light of the Bible was permitted to shine upon them, they faded like mist before the rising sun, "for not one of them," says Pouchaud, "survives to this day."

No other book on earth has been attacked by such a retinue of scientific and learned assailants as the Bible; and no other book has achieved such signal triumphs over its assailants; for it has not been, up to this day, convicted of a single blunder. We know that it is no part of the design of the Bible to teach the round of the physical sciences, yet revealed and scientific truth touch each other occasionally, and, when they do come in contact, they must harmonize, for God is the author of nature as well as the Bible; and if the facts of the Bible come within the purview of science, it is proper that they be submitted to the test of scientific examination. If, in a single instance, it is made to appear that there is a contradiction between an established truth of nature and the Bible, the whole book will be set aside as false.

The literature of high antiquity comes down to our times replete with the philosophy and science then taught; and the discoveries of subsequent ages have clearly shown the ignorance and errors of the

past. I will, by way of illustration, adduce an instance or two. Hesiod, in his description of the earth's position between Heaven and Tartarus, says :

"From the high heavens a brazen anvil cast
Nine days and nights in rapid whirls would last,
And reach the earth the tenth, whence strongly hurled,
The same the passage to the infernal world."

This statement appears absurd to a modern astronomer, since it is known to him that for a body to fall even from the sun would require no less than sixty-four days and a half; and from the fixed stars, instead of nine days, as asserted by the Greek author, it would require more than forty-two millions of days.

Again: Herodotus gives an account of a naval expedition sent out by the government of Egypt. The expedition went along the western coast of Africa, and returned after the lapse of three years. In the official report of that expedition it was stated that they had reached a point where their shadows, at noon, fell toward the south. This statement conflicted with the teachings of the science of that time, and Herodotus declares the whole report as unworthy of confidence. Hence we perceive that physical science, as taught in the days of Herodotus, has given place to modern scientific research.

If we were to find such immature statements within the limits of the sacred volume put forth as substantial or established truth, our faith in its Divine origin would end. The Bible was written in an age when a false cosmogony and a false astronomy were every-where received, and if the writers had not been guided by the omniscient mind, they surely would have, in many things, betrayed an ignorance of physical truth which would certainly bring it into disrepute, as the laws of nature were developed and understood. But is there an instance on record?

"The Bible," says Bishop Marvin, "is entitled to be regarded with intelligence and candor as to any minute verbal criticisms, as well in view of the imperfect state of language as the vehicle of scientific thought at the time it was written, as on general grounds of fair criticism. In a popular treatise upon any theme, in popular language, though it may trench on questions of science, the author is not expected to observe the formalities of scientific speech, though he is expected to conform his statements to scientific accuracy. If,

in describing a sunset at sea, he should simply say the sun sank into the water, no fair-minded critic would think of charging him with a want of accuracy, though any man describing the same phenomenon, with a view to the known facts of science, would use very different terms, even when the reader is supposed to know the facts as to celestial phenomena. A writer upon themes not strictly scientific uses language in this popular way. And indeed, sometimes, even now, when one would actually look for accuracy, as in an almanac, for instance, you find such phrases as the 'sun rises,' the 'sun sets,' when in strict truth he does neither. The Bible can not be convicted of blunders with regard to science, upon any such shallow and frivolous pretext as that it uses *popular* language when it speaks of matters involving scientific phenomena. Not only popular language, but also poetic license, if you please, is to be regarded in the same fair light in this as in any other books. A considerable part of it is poetry of the highest order, in which the thought is incandescent with passionate fervor, and thus incarnate in glowing imagery. He who insists on trying this by the straight edge of formal scientific criticism betrays either a narrowness or a disingenuousness which disqualifies him altogether for the function of criticism." He further says: "If the Bible, written at a time when there was but little knowledge of scientific truth, and in a language therefore not favorable to scientific accuracy, has not been convicted of actual scientific falsehood in any one case, after all the light of the nineteenth century has been turned upon it, and the most strenuous effort of criticism has been expended, that fact raises the strongest presumption in its favor; for it is inconceivable that writings so voluminous, touching upon so many points at which there was opportunity to blunder, in an age of absolute ignorance as to these truths, should have escaped errors at once gross and numerous, if they had not been presided over by divine intelligence. Now that, in the light of any fair criticism, this book is free from such blunders is unquestionably true. Every effort to convict it of error falls in the category of one or the other of two classes of false criticism already alluded to. The alleged errors are the apparent but not real inaccuracies of poetic fervor and freedom, or of popular forms of language. Of the first class are such expressions as 'the foundations of the earth,' 'the pillars of heaven,' 'the end of the world,' 'a tabernacle

for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoicing as a strong man to run a race,' 'his going forth is from the end of the heavens, and his circuit unto the ends of it.' Of the second class there may be mentioned these phrases, 'the sun stood still,' 'the face of the earth,' the like of which are in common use even now. Allegations on grounds so frivolous stand self-convicted, and I say without fear that, *as to any established doctrine of science*, no grave ground of objection can be laid. No one text, fairly interpreted, has ever been put to the blush in the presence of any one truth of science."

Let us pursue this line of thought a little further. Thousands of years ago, in an age when the science of astronomy was very imperfectly understood compared with its present status, the patriarch Job said, "God stretched out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." Modern astronomy teaches that the "earth is a star among the stars," and governed by the same law—gravitation—a law by which God is "pleased to manifest his power in the guidance of the orbs of heaven. To a knowledge of that law of operation, man has been permitted to reach." Again, Jehovah said to Job: "Who shut up the sea with doors when it broke forth, as if it had issued out of the womb? When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and thick darkness a swaddling band for it, and established my decree upon it, and set bars and doors, and said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther; and here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed." In this language, written in an age when physical science was unknown, we have the germ of all that physical science has revealed concerning the phenomena of the tides. The stability of the sea involves the organization of the whole solar system.

Some years ago, astronomers taught that the moon has been slowly approaching the earth from the earliest ages of the world. From this motion, the tides due to her influence are now higher than they were in the days of Homer. If this motion were to continue, the time will certainly come when the tides, rising above every obstacle, will overwhelm the earth, and the decree of the Bible, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther; and here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed," would be false, and infidelity would triumph. But astronomical science, better understood, has discovered the fact that this decrease of the moon's distance, due to planetary disturbance

of the figure of the earth's orbit, had its limits fixed quite as positively as those by which God has declared he would restrain the ocean. It is now asserted by astronomers, that the time is coming when the decrease of distance will be changed into an increase, and the moon will slowly leave the earth by the same degrees by which it had, for thousands of years, made its approach, and with it the decrease of the tides; and God's decree, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther; and here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed," is found to be true, and the infidel scientist caused to blush.

Many more quotations from the Bible might be given, showing that science had been truly anticipated, but we will give one more, and then close this part of the subject. God said to Job, "Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days, and caused the day-spring from on high to know his place? That it might take hold of the ends of the earth, it is turned as clay to the seal, and they stand as a garment." It is evident that reference is here made to the admirable order of recurrence of day and night, and the beautiful adjustment by which the dawn breaks upon the earth. "It is turned as clay to the seal," or, as in the Hebrew, "turns itself," evidently alluding to the rotation of the earth on its axis, illustrated by the rolling cylinder seal, such as is found in Babylon, which leaves its impression on the clay, as it is turned about; so the morning light, rolling on over the earth, presenting a variety of forms—mountains and hills, "waving forest and verdant meadows."

But this is not all that is taught in the text. "With how much precision has the day-spring from on high been taught to know his place," and how great the results! "For more than three thousand years science has gone backward, and, with profound research, reveals the fact that in that vast period the length of the day has not changed by the hundredth part of a single second of time." No matter how numerous the causes of change, how diversified in their action, how multiplied in their effects, out of them comes an admirable equilibrium, and the earth, with undying velocity, spins on its sleeping axis. None but the astronomer, in the observatory, can fully appreciate the force of this language. With what implicit confidence he relies on the mighty truth that God has taught the "day-spring from on high to know his place!" "He wished to signalize the meridian passage of his star." "On the preceding night it has passed at such a

moment of time, marked on the face of his clock, and again to-night at the same hour, minute, and second, and even to the very thousandth of a second, true to the bidding of one unchanging Will, his telescope, borne by the revolving earth, glances the visual ray to the very center of the same identical star."

But why this nice uniformity of motion? The scientific answer is, "from the rotation of the earth we derive our unit of time." Besides, if the velocity of the earth should be decreased by the smallest amount, the temperature of the various regions of the earth would be deranged, disorder would enter every kingdom of nature, and, finally, destruction would follow. If the velocity were increased, the same results would necessarily follow. And, further still: "Any change of the velocity of rotation would disturb the equilibrium of the ocean, and cause it to pass the bounds which God assigned to it. For, were the earth stationary, its figure, if even spheroidal, might have maintained its form; but the moment that rotation on an axis commences, the equilibrium is disturbed, another force (the centrifugal) is introduced, and a modification of the earth's form necessarily follows. Hence the earth is protuberant at the equator and flattened at the poles, for the simple reason that, at the equatorial regions, the velocity of the particles are a maximum, and the earth is, therefore, evolved at its equator far above the level which would exist were the earth at rest." Could we arrest the earth's rotary motion, a universal deluge would be the result. With a knowledge of these facts, understanding that the day and the night results from the uniformity of the earth's rotation, and that from this same cause the ocean is restrained within the limits assigned to it, with what force does the declaration sound, "He has compassed the waters with bounds, until the day and the night shall come to an end!" I now simply ask, What contemporary of Job, uninspired, would have stated so accurately the results of scientific research?

One more allusion to the unity of the Bible and science, and I will close this article. Every two or three decades of years the Bible is attacked by some new theory or some results of scientific speculation. The last one is in reference to the destiny of the earth. This will also share the fate of the myriads of speculative hypotheses which have arisen, and have succumbed to scientific research.

In reference to the origin and destiny of planetary and stellar

VOL. VIII.—16.

worlds, Dr. Winchell, Professor Proctor, and other scientists, teach that they have had their beginning in igneous fluidity, and will end in a state of frigidity. We are told that "Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune are in a state of igneous fluidity, and hence uninhabitable, while our moon, and others of the smaller members of the solar system, are in a frozen condition," and that life on them is impossible. This, it is said, teaches that "life on our globe had a beginning and must have an end," and also a "wonderful harmony between the teachings of scientists and the Bible." In the simple fact that our world and all its tenantry had a beginning, and will have an end, there is an apparent harmony; but, in regard to the manner in which that end shall occur, there is a wide disparity between the teachings of these scientists and the Bible.

The inspired teacher informs us "that the heavens (or atmosphere) will pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." This language comes very near to an anticipation of the scientific discoveries of modern science, and yet it was written in an age when the science of chemistry was unknown. But, now that their chemistry is understood, we perceive that the language is adapted to it, in a manner which no uninspired writer would have done. The atmosphere surrounding the earth is represented as passing away with a prodigious noise—an effect which the chemist would predict by the union of its oxygen with the hydrogen and other gases liberated by the intense heat. Yet what scientist was there in those primitive times who would have imagined such a result? The apostle added to the simple statement that the "earth would be burned up," the declaration that its *elements* would be melted. Why this? The thought was that the combustion would entirely destroy the matter of the globe. But the chemist finds that the greater part of the solid earth has already been oxidized, or burned, and on this matter the only effect of the heat, unless intense enough to dissipate it, would be to melt it.

If, therefore, the apostle had said only that the world would be burned up, the skeptical chemist would have inferred that Peter had made a mistake through ignorance of chemistry. But the chemist is disarmed; he can not draw such an inference, for Peter's language clearly implies that only the combustible matter of the globe will be

burned, while the elements, or primordial principles of things, will be melted ; so that the final result will be an entire liquid, fiery globe. And at this point comes the issue, not between science and the Bible, but between far-fetched scientific speculation and the Bible. The issue is, scientists tell us, that the earth will end in a state of frigidity, while the inspired writer declares that it will be "melted with fervent heat."

VII.—GENESIS AND GEOLOGY

GENESIS does not claim to be a work on science, but a simple statement of some important facts relative to the origin of the heavens and the earth, and of some things (but not of all things) in them ; such as fishes and the sea animals, fowls, creeping things, wild and domestic animals, and man, on earth ; and of the sun, moon, and stars, in the heavens. It gives no history, in the full sense of that word, of any of them, nor does it claim to do so. *History* is a methodical statement of events, so arranged as to state, or at least suggest, the connection between causes and their effects. *Natural history* consists in a description and classification of natural objects, as minerals, plants, animals, and so forth. The first chapter of Genesis, of which we now speak, is not a record of this kind. It is not even a *history* of creation. A history of creation would require not only the statement that, "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," but also how it was done, and of what its materials consisted, and how they were arranged, and what effects these materials had on each other. It simply states that the earth was formless, empty, and dark. This is no part of the history of creation ; for the creation was finished, so far as the earth was concerned, before it could have been in this or any other condition.

The account in Genesis is not even a cosmogony ; for it does not claim to be the science of the formation of the world, nor does it contain knowledge duly arranged with reference to general truths and

principles. It gives knowledge, not as founded in the nature of things, but as revealed. The book was written for religious, not for scientific, purposes. It is not even a theological work ; for theology is a science, and not a revelation—a science which treats of the existence, character, and attributes of God ; his laws and government ; the doctrines to be believed and the duties to be done. But Genesis, as it relates to the origin of things, is not a treatise, a written discussion, or an explanation of a particular subject. It states facts, but explains nothing ; because the facts stated are, to us, inexplicable. In the statement of the facts, there is nothing obscure ; but an attempt at explanation might, nay, must, necessarily, involve us, with our present limited capacities, in inextricable intricacies.

If there is any irreconcilable contrariety between the alleged facts of Genesis and geology, then one or the other must be wrong. What are the facts stated in Genesis which are contradicted by geology ? That book says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This is uncontradicted by geology. The next fact stated is, "Now the earth was waste and empty." This is the first condition of the earth mentioned in Genesis. Geology is so far from contradicting this, that it positively affirms it. "Darkness was over the face of the abyss." Geology does not contradict this fact ; but many lovers of the science believe, from the very nature of things, that a dense fog, sufficiently so to cover the entire globe with darkness, must have been the condition of the globe while there was no land above water. The next fact, "And the spirit of God was brooding over the face of the waters." Concerning this, geology says nothing ; and there is, therefore, no contradiction. "And God said, Let there be light ; and there was light." Concerning the origin of light, geology says nothing, and therefore does not contradict Genesis. It only speaks of light in connection with the earth's development. With its origin, nature, and its manner of production, it is, as it must always be, silent. With the *origin of forms* of matter it is familiar ; and of them it speaks, and speaks sublimely. But question her as to the *origin of matter itself*, and she shrinks back in modesty, and says, "I know not." Of one thing, however, she is sure, and that is, that "there was light." In this she agrees with Genesis.

"And God divided between the light and the darkness." Ge-

ology does not teach any lessons on this subject. It recognizes the fact that light and darkness are separate, not commingled; and here is no contradiction. "And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night." The science recognizes these names as distinctive of light and darkness, but declines to say who gave them. This is no part of that science.

"And there was evening, and there was morning, one day." There is no contradiction here. All days have their evenings, whether they are solar or some other days. Concerning *time*, more will be said hereafter.

And God said, "Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it divide waters from waters. And God made the expanse; and he divided the waters which are under the expanse from the waters which are above the expanse." Geology recognizes the existence of the atmospheric expanse, and the effect ascribed to it here. And the expanse is called "heavens," to this day.

"And God said, Let the waters which are under the heavens gather themselves to one place, and let the dry land appear. And God called the dry land earth, and the gathering together of the waters he called seas." The earlier submergence and the later emergence of the land are facts of great importance in geological science. The whole theory of the formation of rocks, sedimentary, is based on the fact of a former submersion of the earth, and the sedimentary rocks now on the surface assert the emergence. The earth was "born of water."

And God said, "Let the earth put forth shoots, herb setting seed, fruit tree, bearing fruit after its kind, in which is its seed, above the earth." This fact is every-where recognized by geology, in all that relates to that science; namely, "And the earth brought forth shoots, herb setting seed after its kind, and tree producing fruit, in which is its seed, after its kind;" for "men do not gather figs from thistles, nor grapes from thorns."

And God said, "Let there be light in the expanse of the heavens, for dividing between the day and the night. And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days, and for years; and let them be for lights in the expanse of the heavens, for giving light on the earth." These lights were made for the purposes specified. Though they belong more to the science of astronomy than to geology, yet they

influence the earth and its productions so much that their existence and earthly utilities are very important in geological science ; and its testimony is confirmatory of the Scriptural statement relative to their relation to our planet.

And God said, "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living beings ; and let fowl fly above the earth, along the expanse of the heavens." Geology recognizes the fact that such a state of things existed at a very remote period, and still exists.

And God said, "Let the earth bring forth the living being after its kind ;" and geology says, as Genesis says, "And it was so."

"And God made the beast of the earth after its kind, and cattle after their kind, and every reptile of the ground after its kind." The very remote antiquity of all these "kinds," and the law of inheritance, are among the earliest lessons of geology.

"And God created the man in his image ; in the image of God created he him ; as male and female created he them." Genesis and geology both agree that man was the crowning work of this grand display of wisdom and power. Though geology, like all the natural sciences, which have nothing to do with any thing but that which *exists*, can not testify in favor of the *creation*, it is of necessity compelled to say nothing against it. On all other matters of fact, Genesis and geology are agreed ; and on the fact of a creation they never did, and never can, disagree.

Having taken this brief view of facts, we now propose to state the *periods* of Genesis, for the sake of use hereafter ; and then the periods of geology, for the same purpose.

PERIODS OF GENESIS.

1. The creation of the heavens and the earth, the waste and empty condition of the earth, the prevalence of darkness, for a time, over the face of the abyss, the brooding of the Spirit of God over the face of the waters, the production of light—"One day."

2. The making of the expanse, the separation of the vaporous from the more dense waters by the atmosphere, which was caused to expand around the globe, the naming of the expanse heavens—"A second day."

3. The separating of the waters from the land, the collecting of waters into different bodies, called "seas," the appearing of the dry

land, called earth; the bringing forth shoots, herb setting seeds, fruit tree bearing fruit after its kind—"A third day."

4. The making of the sun, moon, and stars—"A fourth day."

5. The stocking of the waters with living beings, and the atmosphere with winged animals—"A fifth day."

6. The making of land animals, and a man and a woman—"The sixth day."

THE SUBDIVISION OF GEOLOGICAL TIME.

"1. Azoic time or age." The time without life.

"2. Palæozoic time." The ancient life time. This included :

"(1.) The age of mollusks, or Silurian.

"(2.) The age of fishes, or Devonian.

"(3.) The age of coal-plants, or Carboniferous.

"3. The Mesozoic time." The middle time.

"(4.) The age of reptiles.

"4. Cenozoic time." The recent or late life time.

"5. Era of mind.

"6. The age of man." (Professor Dana.)

This division of time includes all the time which has elapsed since the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the production of light. Of these geology, as a natural science, as already remarked, can not speak. It discusses the structure, the mineral constitution, and the history of the globe. If there is any contradiction between Genesis and geology, it must be in relation to either the structure, the mineral constitution, or the history of the earth. Of the structure—that is, the form and putting together—of the earth, Genesis says nothing. Nor does it say any thing of its mineral constitution. If, therefore, there is any disagreement or contradiction between them, it must be a question of history, and history as relates to the earth and to nothing else; for this is all the history involved in geology. Not so with Genesis, which contains much historic matter in relation to the men of whose origin it speaks.

Geology begins its history of the globe with the formation of its rocks. It divides the earth into three kingdoms, which are generally named the Animal, the Plant, and the Crystal kingdoms. Genesis does the same thing, but in a different order, corresponding with the chronology of their beginning; thus, the Crystal, the Plant or

Vegetable, and the Animal. The materials of the globe come first, then the plants, then the marine animals, the land animals, and man.

We are not to infer, however, that, when one of the later periods commenced, one of the earlier ceased; for the three are all now existing, and each has its continuous history. Genesis speaks only of a few things which belong to the vegetable kingdom, as shoots, herbs, and fruit-trees, they being more intimately connected with the main object of the book. It does not say that these were all the vegetable productions of the earth. Geology, as it should, notices more. The algæ, or sea-weeds, appear to have existed first of all. Many others, too delicate for fossilization, may have existed at the same time.

The greater abundance of sea animals, near the shores of continents and of islands of the seas, indicates that much of their food comes, directly or indirectly, from the land. What are called "banks," which are formed by the influence of currents and eddies, directed and formed by contiguous lands, are the abodes of many marine animals, whose food is brought by currents from the lands and deposited, or at least detained and collected, on these banks. Microscopic animals feed on the most delicate food, and larger animals feed on them, while these again become food for still larger ones; and this lays the foundation for the adage, "The big fish eat the little ones." Many larger animals feed directly on land products in vegetable transformation, or on insects and on worms, who subsisted on some vegetable product. And though the sea may be called the mother of swarms of living beings, the land must be regarded as the father, in the sense of the *provider*, for all these children. Genesis does not go into detail on this subject, for reasons before stated; but it gives vegetable life the precedence of all animal life. Geology recognizes the first manifestation of life, and in its simplest forms, as that of plants of the lowest grade. "As plants are primarily the food of animals, there is reason for believing that the idea of life was first expressed in a plant." (Dana, Professor of Geology and Natural History in Yale College.) What this distinguished geologist says "there is reason in believing," Genesis states as a fact, long before there was a science of geology.

Geology is unable to speak of the *origin* of life. It can speak of ancient and vegetable life—the life mentioned in Genesis—but not of

its *origin*. This belongs to another department of science. There can be, therefore, no contradiction between the two here. Nor can philosophy contradict revelation here; for geology shows that there was an Azoic Age of long duration before any life dawned on our planet. Life had, then, a beginning, and is found only in connection with organic matter, *none of which could be manufactured out of inorganic matter, even with living organisms to attempt the work*. Many elements which enter into the structure of animals and plants, and subserve the proper performance of their functions, are not, in reality, constituents of organic tissues, nor of secondary products. They exist in mere physical solution, or are found as solid in the bones or teeth in purely inorganic form, and are clearly distinguishable from the state of organic combination in which the carbon, hydrogen, and nitrogen of tissues and secretory products are combined.

Life is not a chemical result. Chemical affinities are held in check by vitality. Nothing, while living, can decompose, or be resolved into its chemical constituents. Chemistry can analyze only dead matter. Life is too powerful for all its forces, and resists its entrance on analysis till vitality leaves. In that instant, seeming anxious affinities commence their work of decomposition. Life is, therefore, a vital, and not a chemical, force. An opposing, and not an allied, force is to be ever witnessed between these contestant rivals. Life in Genesis is, in its origin, imputed to the Creator; and geology, and all the sciences which are called to consider it, accept it as something already existing, the origin of which they can not reach; and they leave their admirers to accept, in reason and becoming humility, and without an attempt at contradiction, the oracle of God on the subject. Concerning the beginning of the life of vegetables and the lower animals, intimation is clear; but, concerning the life of man, it is most explicit. "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul." The breathing was not that of atmosphere, for the purpose of inflating the lungs of a living infant, but the breathing of "the breath of life," for the purpose of giving life where it was not before possessed. This life was made hereditary, to be enjoyed by many. It was literally "the breath of lives." The inflation of the lungs of a dead man with atmosphere, though often repeated, would never impart life to him. This was a case of resurrection of a dead person—a doctrine clearly revealed in the Scriptures,

and yet denied by many, though confirmed by the necessities of this case. *The first man that lived was raised from the dead.*

"Life," though so abundant in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and surrounding us and interpenetrating us at all points, is so difficult of definition that nothing satisfactory has yet been accomplished in that direction. It can neither be weighed nor measured, seen nor handled. It can not be examined by the chemist, nor produced in the laboratory. It is known only by its phenomena, and these are as various as are the kinds of life. Living matter can alone *develop* and produce materials for tissue, secretion, and deposit. It alone can grow and produce matter like itself from matter materially different from itself in its composition, its properties, and its power. No chemist can produce it. Chemistry, analytic and synthetic, is concerned in the examination of dead matter. It begins with dead matter, proceeds with dead matter, and ends where it commenced. As, in the course of nature, nothing can produce living matter but live matter itself, the question arises, Whence came the *first* living matter? Here, exactly where all the sciences are mute, Genesis says, God made it; and all the sciences meekly and reverently bow their assent to the oracle, as a revelation, justified by the only inference left them. There is no contradiction between revelation and science. In all the marvelous discoveries made by the microscope relative to the physical basis of life, there is not a single fact that contradicts any statement in Genesis.

The argument of Genesis and geology, as to the fact that the simplest organisms in both the vegetable and animal kingdoms were succeeded by the more complex, is not surprising, since truth always harmonizes; but the surprise would be great on any other hypothesis than that the fact was *revealed* in Genesis, since there was no geology to discover it in fossils, when that book was written.

Life itself is something unsolved, and, indeed, unsolvable, by science, since it comprises so many results, and exhibits changes so complicated and so diverse from each other, that the subject is inexhaustible. The life of a man or of an animal contains within it phenomena, things differing essentially in kinds, as mechanical and chemical; and also others of a class entirely different from either of these; namely, vital phenomena, which have never yet been satisfactorily accounted for. Some say that "life is the sum of all the actions

going on in the body." This "sum" consists of very different kinds of actions, the analysis of which will demonstrate the absurdity of the definition. To add all these, without reference to kind, into one "sum" total, is to confound things as different as things well can be, and leave the whole undefined and unexplained. Vital action is as distinct from mechanical and chemical as any one thing can be from another. It often successfully resists both.

It is urged that Genesis and geology differ as to *the time* required for the development of the earth, so as to become adapted to the purpose which it now subserves—the purpose of life. Six days are assigned to this grand work by the author of Genesis. As to the length of these days, nothing is said by Moses. They are not measured by seconds, minutes, and hours, like solar days. That they were not *solar* days is evident from the fact that three of them passed before *sol*, or the sun, was made luminous. The calendars which we use are based on solar time, and are made with express reference to the sun. The time occupied in the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the adjustment of all things therein, began too early for our method of time-keeping; and, having been begun, it was continued till the work was finished, without any change of method, even after the sun and moon were made

"To measure day and night
To mortal man."

A day with us consists of twenty-four hours, consisting of an average of twelve hours of light and twelve of darkness. This, however, will not hold good all over the globe. At the poles there could be but one day in a year, if a day includes alternate periods of both light and darkness.

The days of cosmical creation and development excluded the night entirely. God divided the light from the darkness, and called the light day, and the darkness night. The six days of Genesis were six periods of light, the length of which was not measured by the sun. Each day ended with an evening and commenced with a morning; the former in the retrospect, being the first toward us, is first mentioned. The day began with light, and ended when the darkness came on. This utterly excludes the twenty-four hour reckoning. It is stated that there was evening and morning in each of these six

days ; and this is not affirmed of any other days, because other days include the nights.

These days, mentioned in connection with what was done in world-making, are not affirmed to be consecutive days, in the Hebrew Scriptures. They are mentioned as successive with reference to what was done, first, second, third, etc.; as a man might say that he had worked six days on a piece of work, when several days may have intervened between each two days. He might say that he did such a part of the work "day one," and such a part "a second day," and such another part "a third day," and so forth. The same may be said with reference to the more definite but inaccurate rendering of the common version ; "the first day" meaning the first day that God worked, "the second day" meaning the second day he worked, etc., and not the first day and second of all time. The Hebrew expressions, "one day," "a second day," "a third day," and so forth, must be shown by the infidel to mean, not the first day of work, but the first day of time, and the second and third day of time, and not of work, before he can show a contradiction between Genesis and geology.

Moreover, these six days of work, if they consisted of only twelve hours each, or even of a shorter period, may have allowed intervening time enough to account for all the geological changes that occurred. The idea that it required continued time for the Almighty to do any thing, without the intervention of second causes, is very absurd. It is not stated, nor justly inferred, that the whole of either day was spent in the work done on that day. If continued time was required, it was because physical agencies were employed to effect what almighty power could have effected in an instant. The act of creation must, of necessity, have been instantaneous. For a thing could not exist by degrees. It must either exist or not exist.

The command to the Israelites to rest on the seventh day, in commemoration of the fact that God ceased from his work of creation on the seventh day, proves nothing, positively, as to the *length*, but simply as to the *number*, of the days in which all things were made. The time of their labor and rest was evidently solar time ; but we have proved that the time of his creation and development of the heavens and the earth did not begin with the rising and setting of the sun ; but before there was any sun prepared to shine on

the earth. Their six days of labor could adequately commemorate any other six days, whether long or short. The same is true, also, of their rest on the seventh day. The institution of the Sabbath, or rest, was necessary to their secular good ; and the designation of the seventh day for that purpose secured also their spiritual interest, when religiously used. To begin the account of the creation and development with ante-solar time, and end it with solar time, could only end in confusion ; and therefore the account is continued without change of time, and in the same style ; as, there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day, a fifth, and the sixth day—a style entirely unnecessary if an ordinary day was intended, as all would know that all such days included evening and morning. The intimation is pretty evident, to persons of reflection, that reference is not made to ordinary days.

If the whole of each day was spent in what is said to have been done in each, the days could not have been ordinary days, as is evident from geological science. That rocks were formed by secondary causes, no one will deny. That these causes operated very slowly, must be admitted by all. It is evinced by our own observation of rocks of the very same material in different stages of formation, from the sand-bar to the solidest sandstone rock, from soft clay to rocks made of the same material, from beds of pebble to conglomerate rocks, and so forth, through all the variety of rock formations. Rocks are “the foundation of the earth,” as certainly as they are of buildings which we construct. The foundation of a building is under it ; and so is the foundation of the earth. The lowest part of a building is its foundation ; and the lowest part of the earth is its foundation ; that is, its center. It is as really down, toward the center of the earth at one point on its surface as at any other point on its surface. Solidity in this globe was indispensable to the object for which it was made, and therefore its foundation is laid deep and strong. The greater part of the globe consists of minerals. As we lay rock upon rock in the foundations of our little buildings, so God has laid stratum upon stratum, of vast thickness and extent, in the foundation of the earth. Each stratum required long ages for its formation ; and the days by which the time of this wonderful work is measured, clear up till man appeared, are long in proportion to the grandeur and glory of the works assigned to them ; and the reckoning is be-

gun before sun, moon, or stars threw their rays of light on the earth. They were God days, not human days, not solar days. If all the work had been done by the direct exertion of almighty power, excluding all secondary interference, an instant only, and not a week, would have been required. But Genesis excludes our calendar by one which measured time for God before sun, moon, or stars were made luminous for the earth. Light, independent of all these bodies, was the first-born of this lower creation. It was at first an infant—mere twilight—but became developed into an adult when God divided between the light and the darkness, and it became the measure of day ; for God called the light day, and the darkness he called night.

As already noticed, creation must, of necessity, be an *instantaneous* act ; for a created thing must become such instantaneously, as a thing can not exist, and not exist, at the same instant. God was not all day at work in creating the heavens and the earth, and in making light and dividing it from the darkness, as men spend time in labor. The fact that he said, " Let there be light, and there was light," does not prove that light was produced in an instant ; but simply that the decree was fulfilled. The production of light (we do not say the creation of it), and the separating it from the darkness, occupied "one day." The production of light could not, as a fact of creation, have occupied even one solar day. But if it was produced by the agencies of second causes, it may have required a very long period.

The present state of science is such that we are required to speak cautiously relative to light. The nature and physical causes of it are even now among the unsettled problems of natural science. The old doctrine of the emanation of infinitesimal particles of the sun's substance to the globe, in combinations called rays, has given way to the wave theory. Now, all the phenomena of light are regarded as arising from an exceedingly attenuated medium which is thrown into waves by all kinds of luminous bodies, and which fills universal space ; and is difused through the substance of the solid bodies, and occupies the spaces between their molecules, which transmit and modify these vibrations. The vibrations which produce different colors are astonishingly small, there being for violet 57,490 in one inch, and in red 39,180, while in white light 610,000,000,000 vibrations of this luminous matter act on the eye in one second ! It is held

that two portions of light may interrupt and neutralize each other at the point of interruption, and produce darkness. Whatever would produce these vibrations would produce light, whether sun, moon, or stars existed, as such, or not. Chemical influences have much to do with light. The sun, moon, and stars are not the only light producers, as the chemist's laboratory attests, and as is seen in the effects of heat, in cases of friction, electricity, and phosphorescence. In the chemical adjustments of the fifty-four undecomposed substances, called elementary substances, of which this globe is composed, who can tell how much light and how many intervals of light may have been produced? The mysteries hanging about the subject of light caution the investigator not to be dogmatic in his statements where matters are rather problematical than clearly settled. We love the sciences, and esteem the scientific men, who have labored so faithfully and accomplished so much, and who know enough to be modest when so much remains to be learned.

Under ordinary circumstances, light and heat are associates. This is not only so with solar light and heat, but it is true in most cases in which artificial light is produced. Although little is said, comparatively, of light and heat, in geological works, they being regarded as themes of natural philosophy, they are among the most powerful agents in the great changes which have taken place in the history of the earth. In truth, there is but one great science in the universe, and what we call the sciences are only branches of it. The earth could not have been developed without these two agents; and it is not wonderful that the production of light is so early noticed in *GENESIS*; and being so closely connected with heat, the mention of one implies the existence of the other. The sun is not only a great light, but a great heat also. Latent light and latent heat are developed at the same time and by the same means. They are not only latent in terrestrial substances, but seem to have been so, primarily, in the substance of the sun, and of all the heavenly bodies also. The substance of the sun is not a simple and uniform substance. No one knows what changes took place in its primitive physical constitution before it was made "a great light; and it is therefore unphilosophic to assert that it is the first light that shone on this planet. It is neither the source of all light nor of all heat. Geologists seem satisfied that this globe was once a molten mass. If so, whence came

the heat? and was there not light also? did they both come from the sun? "God said let there be light," and, obedient to the fiat, "light was." Darkness fled before it, and thus "God divided between the light and the darkness." The darkness and the light were together before this; that is, the light was latent before this time, and was then developed. It was not solar light, but that which was developed by the brooding of the Spirit of God over the dark waters. It was the divine power which resulted in the physical laws by which matter was to be henceforth governed; and the two great chemical agents, light and heat, by which so many, and so great changes have been produced, were developed from the chaotic mass. The light and heat disengaged during chemical combinations, even in our small laboratories, is wonderful, when duly considered. What must it have been when the whole globe was a laboratory, and all the elementary substances were forming their compounds? "God said, Let light be; and light was;" and heat also.

Water, of which a vast quantity, sufficient for the baptism of the earth, had been formed, from due proportions of oxygen and hydrogen, is a powerful agent in chemical operations, not only as a solvent, but in new compounds, of which it is a constituent. In it were contained all the constituents of the earth, till God separated the land from the water. It precipitated all the mineral matter of which inorganic nature consists, and performed an important part in the formation of the rocks, which compose what is called "the earth's crust." Stratum after stratum was formed, and settled by its own specific gravity, which caused, in the descent of each, an influx of water from other localities, bringing with it diverse material for a new formation, until the forces below resisted the burdensome impositions, and threw them up in mountain ranges, parallel, or nearly so, to the great waters. Between these ranges, valleys were formed, which seem proud of their little hills, which mark their surfaces for rills and brooks and rivers for surface drainage. By these means, and the formation of an atmosphere of sufficient specific gravity to raise the vapors above the waters and the land below, "the dry land appeared." Thus we interpret Genesis thus far without any demurrer from geology. Here ends, strictly speaking, the lifeless age. In all this time no germ of life appeared, no form of life known to us could have existed amid such chemical conflicts as must have been produced. There

was earth enough and water enough, but both were unfit for life. The war of elements was too great and too severe for that tender thing which we call life.

Here the tumult ceased, but the smoke of battle was still on the field. The atmosphere was charged with too much carbonic acid to admit of animal life. It must, therefore, be disposed of in some solid form to admit of animal respiration. Evolved in large quantities, it was a capital fire-extinguisher, and served a good purpose as an extinguisher of primeval flame. Though destructive of nutriment for animal life, it is food for vegetables, which were the first living things on earth.

Genesis says nothing concerning the algæ, or sea-weeds, supposed to have been the earliest vegetable production of the earth, but proceeds directly to notice "the dry land" productions; nor does it claim to be a treatise on botany. It notices only those vegetables which are most directly connected with land-animal existence. Nor does it say that the vegetables therein mentioned were the earliest. There is, therefore, no contradiction here. Neither does it affirm that no other vegetables existed at the same time that shoots, seed-setting herbs, and fruit-trees existed. Ample room is left for the geologist to say all that his science teaches relative to the age of acrogens, or coal plants, and the ample provision for the Carboniferous Age, without contradiction from Genesis. By the production of all these plants the atmosphere was better prepared for land animals by the absorption of carbonic acid, and in other changes in the atmosphere and climate, both of which must have been materially affected by abundant vegetation.

Sea-weeds and mollusks, neither of which are expressly mentioned in Genesis, were contemporary. Genesis says that "the waters swarmed with swarms of living beings," an expression sufficiently ample for all that geology claims. This period was also the period of winged fowls, a fact well established by geological science.

It is affirmed that all the swarms of the seas and the flocks of the heavens were made after their kinds; and, after all that can be justly said relative to changes produced by cultivation, change of climate, domestication and crossing, it is still as true that the eagle's egg will not produce a turkey, as that "men do not gather figs of thistles, nor grapes of thorns."

Following up the scale of animated nature, approved both by Genesis and geology, we come to the beasts of the earth, contradistinguished from cattle, the former roaming abroad on the earth, and the latter preferring the haunts of even uncivilized men. These were made after their kind. That wild animals may be domesticated, and tame animals may become wild, we do not dispute. Nor does Genesis deny the fact. But with this change the panther would not become a pig, nor would the pig become a bear. Crossings may be made within certain limits, beyond which we can not go. There can be no crossing between a sheep and a deer, nor between a swine and a bear. At the time Genesis was written, animals were classified as now, so far as that book goes, and we see no good reason why we should depart from that classification.

Last in the ascending scale, according to Genesis and geology, comes Adam, man—human beings, both male and female. Geology subdivides time into ages, beginning with the Azoic, and ascending thus: The Azoic, or age without life; the age of mollusks, or invertebrate animals, having soft, fleshy bodies; the age of fishes; the carboniferous age, or the age which produced abundance of coal plants; the reptilian age, or age distinguished by numerous reptiles; the mammalian age, or the age of the highest class of animals having a spinal column, and characterized by the female nourishing its young at the breast; and the age of man. This scale is made from the best data furnished by geological observation. It places man last in the ascending scale, as does Genesis. The question, How did the writer of that book come to know this scale long before there was any such science as geology known? is one easy to answer by those only who believe that it was revealed to him by the Originator of all these things.

The philosophy of life, by which we mean a knowledge of vital phenomena as explained by, and resolved into, causes and reasons, powers and laws, is a very comprehensive and complicated subject, into which Genesis and geology do not enter, and, consequently, they do not here disagree. It is divided into two kinds—vegetable or plant life, and animal life. We mention plant life first, because it is the most ancient. The nearest approximation of these two lives is entirely below the view taken of them by Genesis and geology, it being in the microscopic regions. They approximate so nearly there that the line between them is not yet distinctly drawn. But we are

not thence to infer that they are the same ; *because the fuller development of them shows that they are not identical.* Vegetable life, in its fullest extent, is found in the largest trees, and animal life in the largest animals, between which the difference is too great for identification. Vegetable life is the same through the whole plant kingdom, however different the innumerable plants may be. The same is true of the animal kingdom. The larger and the more perfect the plant and the animal, the fuller the development, and the more striking the difference between the two lives. To insist that they are the same in their original condition, because we can not mark the separation, is to reject the proof which they both furnish in their development. How things so different from each other as a tree and an elephant could have come from the same germ of life, originally, is more difficult to explain than to draw the separating line between the first plant life and the first animal life. The facts in their history show that they were not originally the same ; otherwise how could they have become so different, under the unchangeable laws of nature, for which scientists so zealously contend ? Under such law, all must have remained alike. They must all have remained vegetable or all become animal. Or, if another unchangeable law had intervened, called the law of evolution, by which the lowest form of life developed into the highest, we must expect to find the lowest animal life developed from the highest vegetable life. In that case we would find the lowest animal life evolved from the highest vegetable life—from trees, for instance—not in the waters nor in the atmosphere. The ascending scale requires this. Instead of this, we find the lowest animal life clear down with the lowest vegetable life, and so near to it that the line can not be accurately drawn between them. Is this evolution ? This is a strange unrolling or unfolding. We can understand evolution in respect to the extraction of mathematical roots, but not in the sense of one life changing into another so decidedly diverse. Vegetable life is dependent on the earth and atmosphere directly ; but animal life indirectly, by the products of these agents. No animal can live by eating soil only, however highly manured, and by breathing atmosphere. The soil produces vegetables, which are food for animals, and these become food for other animals. The properties of the earth must be either vegetableized or animalized before they can nourish animals. They must first be vegetableized. The chemical substances of the

soil which nourish vegetables, as obtained in the laboratory, are not the food for animals. No man would select a laboratory for a boarding-house, knowing that the table would be furnished with such materials for food, nor would he accept oxygen and hydrogen for drink. He would accept the products of the soil for food, and the proper combination of oxygen and hydrogen for drink, especially if it contained a strong infusion of tea or coffee.

The objection to the truth of Genesis, because it has not instructed us in the matters before mentioned, is equally good against the truth of geology. Some men infer the ignorance of the ministers of Christ on these subjects, because they do not preach and write concerning them; and some of them oppose them. By the same rule we may infer their ignorance of God's revelation, because they do not discourse and write about it, and some of them oppose it.

We are for science and the Bible both; and we are happy in the belief that there are many ministers who have at least a respectable knowledge of the sciences generally. We take pleasure in saying that we feel kindly to men of science, and that we are under many and great obligations to them for the little we know of these matters. We ask them to treat us kindly and fairly, as we are disposed to treat them. There can be no good intention in treating religion with disrespect, and in robbing poor mortals of the hope of a future and a better life.

The doctrine of the evolution of the human species from the animals is contradicted by the facts in Genesis and geology. The ascending scale is recognized in the animal as well as in the vegetable kingdom; but in neither is the theory of development, in the sense of one species evolving or evolving another, justified by facts. That all animals of every kind originate, and have originated, from eggs, ever since the first eggs were "hatched," is a fact admitted by all respectable naturalists. These eggs are also of the same character. The sum of their distinguishing qualities, by which they are known as eggs, is the same. We are not to infer from this fact that they are all of one kind; and that therefore all animals have descended from one primordial kind; for there are more kinds of eggs than one; and this is the only reason why there are more kinds of animals than one.

Every kind of animal, in its origin, must have existed either in an egg, or have been "created after its kind." The question, "Which

was first, the egg or the hen?" has puzzled many. If we say, "The hen existed first," then comes the question, "How can there be a hen without an egg?" The only rational answer to the question of the *genesis*, or origin, of every thing is, *God made it; and made it after its kind*. This is true whether eggs or hatched animals were first. If he made the eggs, or seeds of things, and placed them in circumstances which developed the animals and plants, he is the author of all thence proceeding. It would seem that the inhabitants of the earth and of the seas sprang from eggs or seeds, from the expressions, "Let the earth *put forth* shoots, herb setting seed, fruit-tree bearing fruit after its kind," and "Let *the waters swarm* with swarms of living beings."

Geology, in its most ancient discoveries, recognizes the different species of things, in both the vegetable and the animal kingdom, as strongly marked as they are now. It knows nothing of evolution, in the technical sense. It recognizes the fact that things existed in the Palæozoic time, as now, each "after its kind." Hence the division into radiates, mollusks, articulates, and vertebrates, with all their vast subdivisions, "after their kinds." The idea that older species developed new ones, because the latter succeeded, and surpassed, in perfection of organism, the former, is purely imaginary. The inference that, because the bones in a man's skeleton can be compared with corresponding bones in a monkey, bat, or seal, he must, therefore, in his origin, once have been a monkey, a bat, or a seal, is without premises, and therefore illogical. The differences between these animals are so many and so great that the evidence to the contrary is positively overwhelming. If a few correspondencies suggest the identity of origin, will not a hundred differences correct the suggestion? Or is the negative evidence to be rejected for the sake of a groundless theory? Suppose this is true of other parts of these animals, is there no difference between them? Is a man a monkey, a bat, or a seal? And if the correspondence in one case proves that the man was once a monkey, will it not also prove that he was once a bat, and once a seal? Will not the negative evidence, so vastly preponderating, in so many differences, prove the reverse? The correspondencies can prove no more with reference to the past than with reference to the present. If, therefore, they prove that man once was a monkey, a bat, or a seal, they will

prove that he is still the same; for these correspondencies still exist. The man is what he is, the monkey is what he is, the bat is what he is, and the seal is what he is. Are they identical? *If the correspondencies prove any thing of sameness relative to the past, they must prove the same with reference to the present also.* We admit the correspondence,

“But a man 's a man for a' that,”

and a monkey is a monkey, a bat is a bat, and a seal is a seal, for all that.

But it is said that “man is developed from an ovule” “which differs in no respect from the ovules of other animals.” Had the amiable author said “in no” perceivable “respect,” he would have been accurate. But, in speaking unqualifiedly, he has affirmed what is not true. If the ovule differs “in no respect from the ovules of other animals,” why does not the ovule produce the other animals instead of man? or the ovules of the other animals produce man instead of the other animals? That science can detect no constitutional difference we freely admit. But that there is a difference is proved beyond dispute; for the ovules produce different kinds of animals. There is, then, a difference which even the microscope can not detect, and on which the various kinds of animals entirely depend.

We submit these statements, brief as they are, as a full answer to all that Mr. Darwin has said in the way of argument in his book on the “Descent of Man,” while we acknowledge our obligation to him for the great variety of information which his book contains; and we fall back upon the non-conflicting testimony of Genesis and geology in reference to the matters on which they both speak.

Will the patient reader permit us to say, that the statement of Genesis relative to the origin of things is, to us, the most direct, clear, unornamental, and sublime statement we have read on that subject? It, without claiming to be a scientific work, anticipates all the facts of geology relative to what it speaks, long before any such science was known, and presents the seal of truth revealed; and truth confirmed by the later researches of men of science and sound learning.

VIII.—THE QUESTION OF THE HOUR.

IT may be safely affirmed that, in the life of every man, there is a crisis. There is a day in our history for which all other days were made. There is one eventful moment of our existence into which is compressed all the mysteries of life and death. It is that hour of surpassing moment when the soul turns the glance of its vision inward, and realizes, to the fullest degree, its lost and sinful condition. Indeed, there can not enter into the human mind a conception of more unutterable sorrow, more wide and dreary desolation, than the state of an immortal soul when it is conscious that it is living "without God and without hope in the world."

And in this self-same conscious hour of its conviction, realizing the helplessness of an impenitent condition, recognizing the unsatisfying nature of earthly pleasures, and knowing that unanswered longing and deepest distress can be its only portion if the call of duty is unheeded, it is at last brought to that critical juncture when it cries out from the depths of its agony, "What must I do to be saved?" Yes, it is the old, yet ever new, query in the hearts of all humanity, the great problem of life and death. And it is none the less important to-day, though it has gone surging up and down the stormy hearts of millions of weary lives since that eventful night, so long ago, when it burst from the quivering lips of the Philippian jailer. Not only so, but the answer of the apostle, which brought peace and joy to the keeper of the prison, can not fail to bring peace and joy to every sinning and sorrowing heart that is asking that question to-day.

The old Gospel which was preached, heard, and believed the self-same hour of that far-off night, is to-day "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." The holy Christ, who stood transfigured in the hearts of his bruised and wounded disciples amid the painful circumstances of those perilous times, is the same Lamb of God who stands knocking at the door of every human heart which has thus far refused him entrance. The promise of the Holy Spirit is just as certain of fulfillment now as it was on the glad day of Pentecost, when thousands bent the knee to the Christ whom they

had slain. Yea, though the world advances, and science sweeps onward with mighty strides, there is no progress in the method of saving immortal souls. The scheme of redemption most fitly represents its Author in the majestic fact that it is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." It stands pre-eminent above the puerile attempts of man's finite wisdom to better the condition of a lost humanity, and treads forth in the conscious dignity of its own godlike independence of human machinery, and in its triumphant ability to redeem a sinful and ruined world. It is the star of hope to the nations that sit in darkness, and the haven of rest to the tempest-tossed of every clime. It creates no false hopes in the human soul, and promises nothing that it will not fulfill. Its deep foundations rest upon the Rock of Ages, and in the magnitude and splendor of its proportions it lifts its proud summit to the glory of the highest heavens. There is no far, outreaching limit that is not embraced within the scope of its generous capacity. There is no height which scornful pride may have attained that it can not hurl to a common level, and no depth of degradation which it can not lift into the ineffable beauty of a nobler life. Like God, its Author, it is "no respecter of persons," yet earnestly desiring and striving to bring all men to the enjoyment of its own inestimable blessings. And when the poor, distracted hearts of the children of men are torn by conflicting doubts and fears, as they seek to know what they must do to be saved, this plan of redemption is unfolded like a scroll, whereon they may read in glowing characters the words of eternal life.

Such is the scope of this divine conception for the salvation of the world. Now, although it may be the desire of many who are remarkable for their zeal in the advocacy of the truth to engage in controversy with all who oppose them, yet he who has the cause of God and the good of mankind most at heart will not enlist his services in discussion for the purpose of gaining a personal victory, but simply with the holy desire to establish the truth of God's Word. And in answering the innumerable cavilings and objections of captious men, who have no desire to know the truth, but seek rather to detect imperfections and flaws in the Christian system, we can only be animated with the laudable desire to vanquish error and defend the truth that shall make us free. Hence it is that we approach the investigation of a subject of so great moment with no doubt of a full and satisfactory result.

The man who is patiently striving to "know the way of the Lord more perfectly," has nothing to fear from the result of his labors. He brings to the consideration of every topic a mind that is unbiased by any sectarian prejudice, and is open to the conviction of God's truth wherever he may find it. It is the bigot alone who trembles with cowardly fear to tread the borders of truth's mighty realm, where God is lord of the conscience, and Christ the redeemer of the soul.

When we come to consider the numerous cases of conversion as related by the sacred historian, the fact is every-where patent that no instances have given rise to more discussion than these. Notwithstanding the circumstances attending these events have been presented with marked fidelity and simplicity, yet their meaning has been so perverted, and their deep significance so distorted, to suit the convenience or idea of some particular theory, that a thousand evils have grown from these painful misconstructions of the Word of God. The cause of this wide discrepancy in opinion may be attributed to the fact that men endeavor to construe these historical accounts in a manner suitable to their own individual theories, instead of conforming their opinions to the teaching of the Word. Thus, in the case of the jailer at Philippi, which is under consideration, it has been wildly conjectured by certain restless minds that the keeper of the prison was simply anxious concerning his immediate safety. To establish this theory, they advance to say, that, under the Roman law, the warden of a prison who had been negligent of duty so far as to permit the prisoners to escape, suffered the penalty of death. And this was true, strange as it may seem when contrasted with the practice of modern days! But, though, in the present instance, the jailer was apprehensive of personal danger, as evinced by his endeavor to take his own life, yet a thorough investigation of the facts will satisfy us that a far deeper significance lay beneath his questioning cry to the apostles. His effort at self-destruction was made while yet ignorant of the fact that his prisoners had not escaped, and the noble spirit of the Roman could not, for a instant, brook the idea of suffering an ignominious death at the hands of the law. Though he was not culpable, as he well knew, in the present instance, yet the thought must have flashed into his mind with lightning rapidity, that there was no hope of establishing his innocence before the Roman judiciary, that an unjust and shameful death must be his fate. In this

dire extremity, what could he do but take his imperiled life in his own hands? That he was about to do a weak thing, an unmanly act, a deed most cowardly, can not be denied in the light of these later and better times. But we must not forget the established code of honor among the ancients, nor the peculiar discipline to which this man was subject. In his mind the idea of suicide took the form of a most brave and honorable act. True, he recognized, as all men must in a similar position, that it was the last resort, that no other alternative was left him, and that he stood on the farthest extremity of mortal life, with no hope in that future where he was about to plunge. Is it, then, a cause for astonishment that he should be arrested in his reckless career, and pause to hearken to the clear, strong voice of Paul, as it rang through the prison: "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here?" In that supreme moment of his life, all the events of his past career must have risen to his mental gaze, and revealed the loneliness of his forlorn and helpless condition. The very character of the question which he put to the apostles is indicative of the fact that he had some conception of this salvation which he was seeking. Doubtless, he had listened to Paul on the preceding day, as the apostle discoursed of "righteousness and temperance, and judgment to come." And although it is not thus distinctly stated, yet we feel warranted in the assumption that these themes occupied the mind of Paul no less at that time than when subsequently he stood in the presence of the trembling Felix, and demonstrated the power of the world to come. So, then, it will be seen that the jailer realized his critical spiritual condition, and had some idea of this salvation of which he had heard. To intimate that he had a just and proper conception of the subject, in all the magnitude and grandeur of its proportions, would be an assumption unwarranted by the facts; but it is sufficient to know that he was conscious of his sinful state, that he saw, dimly though it was, that there was something of peace, and joy, and hope in this world, which he had never found, and of which he yearned in his longing heart to know. This question did not arise in his heart on the previous evening, when he closed the doors against the bleeding disciples. It gave him no anxiety in the midst of health and prosperity, when he stood in no jeopardy of life and fortune. No! It is the old, ever new story, repeated again and again in the history of ten thousand lives. When you press home to the

hearts of men the requirements of the Gospel and the necessity of obedience, they hear you with fretful impatience or languid indifference, and waive the real question at issue, with the words of a hesitating, cowardly Felix, "Go thy way for this time ; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee."

Amid the soothing influences of a fancied security, in the full vigor of health and strength, surrounded by friends and comforts innumerable, deluded by the false glamour of prosperous appearance, and strong in the confidence of victory through self-effort, the soul of man goes forth to brave the conflict, with the delusive hope that it can win the battle unaided by any power divine. It is not in the day of prosperity that men are brought to God. It is amidst the awful storm of misfortune, when the fierce blast of adversity hurls them to the dust, that they lie in the ashes of heart-broken penitence and grief. It is when their lives, with all their lofty aims and proud ambitions, with all their high hopes and splendid dreams, and pictures of future glory, when these poor, broken and shattered lives lie scattered in a thousand fragments, the wretched remnants of former beauty and power ; it is when, sitting down amidst the fallen columns and crumbling arches, surrounded by the wide desolation of a wasted and misspent life ; it is then that they lift their streaming eyes and imploring hands to heaven, and cry, from the depths of their agonizing hearts, "What must we do to be saved?" Do you stop for a moment to raise the trifling and captious query as to *what* it is from which these men seek this salvation ? Can you be so lost to all consciousness of the real wants of your own being, or the nature of the rewards which this world provides, as not to know that men are seeking salvation from something else than mere poverty or hunger or distress ? No ! It is the cry of a lost soul for eternal life. It is the earnest inquiry of a penitent heart for forgiveness. It is the humble entreaty of one who is crying from the depths of his own degradation, and longs to be lifted into the purer atmosphere of a nobler life. It is the hunger in the soul of the prodigal for a mansion in his Father's house, and the love and care of a heavenly home. It is the consciousness, which may come slowly or swiftly, but which must come sooner or later, that upon the soul there rests a heavy load of sin and guilt which only Jesus Christ can take away. And though it can not be said that this Philippian jailer understood the

scheme of redemption other than in a very limited degree, yet the fact is patent to every observing mind that he realized his need of forgiveness and salvation from his sins. He came trembling, as every man must come, and not self-confident, like the haughty Pharisee, who proudly rejects the offer of peace and pardon. Thus we discover the cause of this most important of all inquiries, and are ready to hearken, with the anxious jailer, to the response from Christ's ambassador.

Amid the host of conflicting opinions in the world of theology, which is but another name for the world of contention, it is with the most gratified sense of pleasure and relief that we turn to the clear pages of God's holy Word, and there learn the answer to the question of "what must I do to be saved?" But before entering into an analysis of the facts in this story of the jailer's conversion, it is well to consider the subject of generalization, by which a correct deduction of the truth may be drawn. For whereas the question itself is so general in character as to be the common inquiry of all mankind, yet the reply, in the case of the jailer, was of that specific nature which shows it was adapted to the wants of a particular condition. To those minds who read only to cavil, and look only to detect a blot, it may seem a difficult task to reconcile the various and apparently conflicting answers to this vital question; but when we are capable of "richly dividing the word," and approach its investigation with unprejudiced minds, the light which is inherent with the Gospel will be sufficient to render it at once clear and evident. There can be no difficulty when we collect the numerous replies to this question concerning salvation; and arrange them in such a manner as to discover the elements peculiar to each individual instance, from which a reply can be framed that will cover the entire ground. Nay, more, it is not too much to say that the spirit which seeks to contract the essentials of pardon to the narrow limit of but one requirement, is at variance with the broad and comprehensive scope of the Gospel. So, then, when we regard the answer of the apostle, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house," we can not accept it as conclusive evidence that this was equivalent to being saved by faith alone. Establish this proposition, and you destroy the argument of James, who has most distinctly declared, in words which can not be misunderstood, that "faith without works is dead." Now,

when we take into consideration the several meanings of the term, how it is sometimes used separately and as a thing in itself, and in other instances as productive of repentance and obedience, we can readily comprehend the fitness of this reply to the jailer. Paul did not enjoin upon him a dead faith, but one from which would flow the issues of a pure and spiritual life. And the sequel shows that the faith of this man was not only vital but eminently intelligent, resting, as it did, upon the sure foundation of knowledge drawn from the Word of God; for it is distinctly stated that Paul and Silas "spake the word of the Lord to him, and to all who were in his house." It might not be improper to drop the reflection that it is not at all probable that Paul would speak the Word of the Lord to creatures who could not, in the very nature of things, comprehend a single sentence he uttered. His preaching was addressed to such individuals as could properly comprehend his meaning, and had the ability to think and decide for themselves; and it is to such persons that the Gospel should be presented to-day, for they alone have the power to believe and obey it. The idea of unfolding the wonderful scheme of human redemption to a mind that is not, as yet, conscious of its own existence, is at once sacrilegious and absurd; and to say that Paul, in speaking the Word of the Lord to all who were in the house of the jailer, addressed himself to immature minds or irresponsible persons, is to charge upon the apostle a crime of the gravest and most serious character. Paul never wasted his energies. He never indulged in idle words. Life was too short, and time too precious, to be frittered away in meaningless words and actions. He lived too constantly "under the powers of the world to come" to give men a careless or unsatisfactory reply when questioned concerning their soul's eternal welfare. And so, when this trembling jailer appealed to him thus earnestly to know what he must do, the apostle sent back just such an answer as could be given under circumstances of a similar nature. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ" were the words best adapted to the jailer's condition. Being a heathen, he knew little or nothing concerning the Savior and the purposes of his life and death, save what he might have gathered incidentally from those around him. The first and necessary requirement of him, as of every sinner, was *a living faith in the Son of God*. And we have no evidence that he possessed this faith until the Word of the Lord had

been preached to him—till the apostle had given him a groundwork of knowledge upon which to rest his faith. That "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God, is a proposition not only substantiated in the conversion of the jailer, but abundantly proven by every instance of a sinner's conversion, from the day of Pentecost till now. Faith is no less the moving, vitalizing principle of the Christian life than the magic power by which an entrance is gained into the fold of Christ. It stands at the door as attendant upon the Redeemer, waiting to lead the sinner to Christ. It is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen;" and we know that "without faith it is impossible to please God." In its meekness and humbleness of heart it shows its entire willingness to submit to the will of the Redeemer, by casting its care completely upon him, and uttering the noble sentiment, "Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." It was this that the jailer required, and it was this that Paul preached to him as the first and necessary requisite.

If it be asked, why he was not enjoined to repent, as were the Jews on the day of Pentecost, the reply is, that Peter preached unto them Jesus until they were convicted of their sins, and convinced in their own hearts that this Jesus, whom they had crucified, was both Lord and Christ; and thus already believing the sublime truth, it would have been superfluous in the apostle requiring of them what had already been accomplished. On the other hand, to call upon the jailer to repent toward a Christ of whom he knew comparatively little, and, consequently, in whom he could not believe, would have been contrary to all laws of logic and philosophy, if not an outrage upon reason and common sense. Not only so, but because the word repentance is not to be found in this connection, is no evidence that it was not implied. Nay, we have abundant testimony to prove the existence of a lively and sincere repentance toward God in the heart and life of this man, when we observe the sudden transformation of thought and action, and the kindly act of washing the blood from the painful wounds of the disciples.

But, notwithstanding the faith which must have been produced by the apostle's preaching, and the repentance as evidenced in the actions of the jailer, there are, as yet, no signs of *rejoicing* in his heart, which is one of the necessary "fruits of the Spirit." Evidently, there was something of vital importance yet to be accomplished. If we glance

at the histories of the various conversions, whether of individual instances or taken collectively, it will be seen that the preaching was always adapted to the immediate wants of the sinner. To be more explicit, at whatever point the sinner had arrived in his knowledge of duty and the performance of it, *there the preaching began*. But in no case, among the many that occurred, is it recorded where other than the natural and logical order was followed, requiring the sinner to *believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, repent of his sins, and be immersed into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*. And this is the only full, the only correct, and the only complete Scriptural and apostolic answer to the all-absorbing and vital question of "what must I do to be saved?"

Does any one ask me if I believe that baptism is essential to salvation? I answer back, in the light of God's eternal truth, it is a matter of no moment what I believe, what I think, or to what theory I hold. What says the book? What says God? Let us resurrect the sublime sentiment of Augustine: "*Non valet, hæc ego dico, hæc tu dicis, hæc ille dicit, sed hæc dicit Dominus.*" Nay, let us not stop there, but go back still farther and hearken to the voice of Christ: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." And if it be objected that in the second clause the requirement of baptism does not occur, let it be answered that, if by the acceptance of certain conditions salvation may be gained, certainly it must logically follow that by the rejection of these same conditions, salvation is forfeited and the soul is lost. Not only so, but when we are taught that "he that believeth not is condemned already," it is at once plain why the Savior does not add the clause, and is not baptized, since baptism under such circumstances would not only be devoid of meaning, but have no efficacy whatever. And what does it matter whether it is essential or not? Why speculate as to the efficacy of an institution which is most assuredly divine? Has not God commanded? Has not Christ enjoined? Have not the apostles practiced? Why, then, will fallible man, in his finite wisdom, presume to question the utility of an act by which the Lord himself hath declared, "It becometh us to fulfill all righteousness?" And why, in the name of the God whom they profess to reverence and adore, will men who pretend to bear the Word of Life to a lost and perishing world so far forget their sacred

trust as to send back any other answer to the pleading petitions of trembling sinners than that which is given by the holy apostles of the Lord?

When I think of the sacred call to preach the Word of Life, that does not manifest itself by the "still, small voice" of some supernatural or miraculous agency, but is not other than the royal commission of the Christ, as it rings clear and thrilling and strong above the stormy discords of eighteen centuries: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned;" and when I think of the blessed promises which are contained in this same Gospel, and which will assuredly be fulfilled, and that this religion is not a cheat and a lie, but an eternal reality, and that the radiant Jesus is the only refuge and hope for a dying soul; and when I think of the deep and lasting curse which rests upon him who shall preach any other Gospel than that of the Lord and his Christ, and that men are false to the sacred trust confided to their charge, and throw the dry bones of their miserable, unsatisfying theology to famishing souls, as they would to dogs, and feed the hungry and the starving upon the lifeless husks of opinion, belief, and feeling; and when I see the reckless millions rushing on to inevitable ruin and death—I can no more wonder that a world is lying in wickedness, and that men are living "without God and without hope in the world."

O trembling, dying soul, delay not the hour of thy redemption, but hearken to the heavenly voice of Christ, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy and my burden is light."



S0-BFL-733

